Vol. 2, No. 2 Summer 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITOR'S NOTE

The Occidental Quarterly: A Year in Review — *TOQ* Editors 3

CORRESPONDENCE

Lawrence Auster Critiques Fallon on Steinlight — (*TOQ* Vol. 2, No. 1) 5

Charles A. Roberts on Perry's Review of MacDonald — (*TOQ* Vol. 2, No. 1) 6

ARTICLES

What Makes Western Culture Unique? — Kevin MacDonald 9

Remembering American Wars — Richard Earley 39

CRITIQUES & REJOINDER: THE ETHNIC GAP (VOL. 1, NO.1)

McCulloch, Nordishism, and Enlightened White Separatism — Tristan Torriani 67

The Reality Gap: A Critique of Richard McCulloch's The Ethnic Gap — Michael Rienzi 73

The Ethnic Gap: A Rejoinder to Torriani & Rienzi — Richard McCulloch 81

BOOK REVIEWS

Men Among the Ruins:Post-War Reflections of a Radical Traditionalist — Reviewed by E. Christian Kopff 93

The Siege of Vienna — Reviewed by Wayne Lutton 107

Coloring the News: How Crusading for Diversity Has Corrupted American Journalism — Reviewed by John Attarian 111

Editors 114

Editorial Advisory Board 115

The Occidental Quarterly, a journal of Western thought and opinion, is published four times annually in the Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer. Unsolicited manuscripts from contributing authors should be submitted to the editorial department address: P.O. Box 695, Mt. Airy, MD 21771. Style sheets are available upon request. Subscriptions in the U.S. are $40 annually, $78 for two years, and $114 for three years; subscription rates for Canada $45 (first year), $88 (two years), and $129 (three years); European subscription rates: $60 (first year), $118 (two years) $174 (three years). All subscriptions including additional inquiries or subscription problems should be mailed to the subscription department: P.O. Box 3462 Augusta, GA 30914. Back issues are $10 per issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editor's Note

The Occidental Quarterly

A Year in Review

The publication of this issue rounds out *The Occidental Quarterly*'s first year in print. Since our first issue (Fall 2001), readers quite likely noticed a few changes along the way. Most of these changes reflect stylistic adjustments, in an attempt to improve the journal's overall aesthetic quality. As the journal shifts out of this experimental phase, future issues will have a more consistent style and enhanced professional quality. The first year of publication has enabled us to fine-tune the journal's format and style, and incorporate new editing methods of purging inaccuracies, errors and inconsistencies.

One major permanent change begins with this issue. In keeping with the broader social, political, historical, and cultural elements that distinguish Western civilization from primitive civilizations, the editors have decided to modify the journal's subtitle by replacing "Nationalist" with "Western." The masthead of the journal will in the future more accurately reflect the publication's intended scope as "a journal of Western thought and opinion." While we remain nationalistic rather than globalistic in political sentiment, our primary focus is the cultural, social, and traditional restoration of our Western heritage. Hence, the emphasis on nationalism was, in retrospect, too narrow in focus than originally envisioned. It failed to fully encompass our navigational compass as a journal devoted to advancing the Western culture of our European ancestry.

As we launch into our second year with the next issue, we will continue to give our readers insightful perspectives from original scholarship (and an occasional out-of-print classic) that will enhance our readers' understanding of the decadent hostility that confronts Western peoples, their cultural traditions, and ethnic heritage. To this end, we continue to pledge our commitment and dedicate our efforts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

To the editor:

Joe Fallon has told me that a mistake I have previously alerted him to in his account of the Stephen Steinlight meeting has been corrected, at least on the Web version of *The Occidental Quarterly*. But I gather that the correction could not be made in the print version.

According to Mr. Fallon's original version, Steinlight said that Patrick Buchanan is an anti-Semite, and I then challenged him "to cite even one quotation to substantiate that charge," which Steinlight could not do. That is incorrect. Steinlight did not, at least initially, call Buchanan an anti-Semite, and the quote has now been changed to "racist," which is closer to what he said.

Here is a fuller account of the exchange from my notes, which I wrote down the day of the meeting:

> I asked Steinlight from the floor: 'You've called immigration restrictionists abominable, racist and dangerous, but when Mark Krikorian asked you what specifically you found objectionable about them, you said that it was that they didn't come clean about their own identity politics. Is that all you mean by abominable and racist?' Steinlight gave an evasive answer.
>
> I asked him: 'Can you name anything Buchanan has said on immigration that's racist and dangerous?' He replied that he didn't have any quotes at hand, but that Buchanan was an anti-Semite. This was changing the subject. Joseph Fallon who was at the meeting pointed out to me afterward that if Steinlight really knew Buchanan to have said something so awful, he would have been remembered it and been able to quote him.

I particularly want to clear up this mistake since, as I wrote in an article at *Front Page Magazine* this past April, Buchanan's recent attacks on Israel for defending itself from suicide bombers had persuaded me, to my great sadness, that Buchanan is indeed, as others have insisted for years while I had defended him from the charge, driven by an anti-Jewish animus. As I wrote in *Front Page*, the animus is so great that it drives Buchanan to adopt leftist-style arguments against Israel (such excusing the "oppressed" for horrible crimes while demonizing the "oppressor" for legitimate self-defense) that he would despise in other situations--for example, if it were a matter of black rioters and police. However, though I had not yet come to that definite conclusion about Buchanan as of November 2001 when the Steinlight meeting took place, I still would not have challenged Steinlight on that point, given the many well-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known charges of anti-Semitism that have been made against Buchanan over the past ten years. Anyone who wants to see my reasons for concluding this about Buchanan can look up my article, *An Open Letter to Patrick Buchanan*, (http://www.FrontPageMagazine.com) April 15, 2002.

Sincerely,
Lawrence Auster

Greetings from Austin,

I just completed reading Hugh Perry's very insightful critical remarks on Kevin Macdonald's "Culture of Critique" on your website. It is a fine article and your journal serves the nationalist movement well. I deeply appreciate its value.

I find it curious that in the midst of all the evolutionary talk of "inclusive fitness" that no one has yet confronted the blatant fact that any species that allows itself to be marginalized, and ultimately exterminated, through various forms of evolutionary sabotage and race regression, is probably not fit to exist in the first place. I think Darwin himself (and Herbert Spencer definitely) maintained that the process of "race (or species) suicide acts as a real biological brake for any species that have become increasingly maladaptive. In other words, a species will only continue as long as it is genetically endowed with the effective means to do so. Otherwise, it will perish. This is what Darwinians mean by the term "inclusive fitness."

Are whites following this kind of pattern? Are we actively pursuing through sick immigration and outbreeding patterns our own untimely, genetic doom? It is altogether possible that this is the case. But I think another factor really needs to be considered in this seemingly endless "long argument" regarding the impending fate of the white race. This factor involves the role of the federal government--and its imposition of direct force in implementing the majority of the policies that we as race nationalists reject. When considered from an evolutionary standpoint, the federal government's role in the creation of a super racialist state encompassing ever growing numbers of rootless third world elements is essentially what should rightly be called a normative (or artifical) arrangement. It is, in other words the objective articulation of a strictly formal operative idea--the sum product of countless governmental edicts and impositions. It is an arrangement that is maintained solely through the use of force and intimidation. The physical sinews of this system we are all more than familiar with: the Office of Civil Rights, the IRS, Hate Crimes legal apparatus, the national courts, hyperactive politicians and so on. As Robert E. Lee once predicted, the United States is now a republic maintained at the end of a bayonet.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the same time that this system is normative, it is not adaptive. This means that it is not organic to the traditional spirit in which America was founded and continues, at least in some quarters, to be understood. The present system, therefore, exists much as the old communist regime existed prior to its spontaneous implosion in 1989. That system was also a normative one, and appeared to function just fine as long as there were enough Red Guards and tanks to preserve it. Eventually, however, history and the inability of the communist system to adapt to changing circumstances, brought it down.

I suspect that we are facing a similar situation in the United States at this time. I think all of us understand that America's so called "race problem" (now problem of the races) was created solely through the involvement and duplicity of the American government in destroying the republican form of government in which this country was conceived. It was a naked grab for power that worked extremely well for those in power who benefited from it at the time. This power fulcrum however has now mutated into a global maladaptive disease that is not subject to any effective internal controls. In order to maintain some degree of cohesion at home, America must now embroil the rest of the world in its race problems, along with its sinking indebtedness. As millions of aliens continue to swamp the nation, a growing number of states are struggling to cope with insolvency and growing white flight. As I write these words, the US Congress just voted to increase, once again, the already staggering national debt of 5 trillion dollars.

The present racial spoils system currently prevailing in the United States is, like its Soviet predecessor, economically and socially impracticable. Indeed, whites in increasingly numbers are finally waking up to the swindle. In much the same way, millions of average Russians woke up one day to discover that they were not, after all, living in the worker's paradise they had been promised. Similarly, long before the last white person has expired -- or departed for Australia or Argentina -- the federal racialist and entitlement spoils regime will have collapsed. It doesn't take a genius to figure that out.

It is important to remember that a normative system of political power (and the abuse of that power) can only prevail as long as the system itself continues relatively unstrained by external pressures. It is a system that must always remain either at rest or in nearly perfect motile equilibrium. It is definitely not a dynamic system. This is why normative systems of political and military control -- unless earnestly supported by an intensely nationalistic populace, such systems rarely survive truly aggressive revolutionary movements. We can very safely assume (particularly after the events of last fall), that our own government is not immune to this fundamental socio-biological principle.

Warmest regards,
Charles A. Roberts

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Makes Western Culture Unique?

Kevin MacDonald

In general, cultural uniqueness could derive from either nature or nurture—the same old ageless dichotomy, but I think now we are in a better position to deal with these issues than in times past, and I will be arguing that both are important. Western cultures have experienced certain unique cultural transformations that cannot be predicted by any biological/evolutionary theory, but they also have had a unique evolutionary history. Western culture was built by people who differ genetically from those who have built the other civilizations and cultures of the world. In the following I will argue that Western cultures have a unique cultural profile compared to other traditional civilizations:

1. The Catholic Church and Christianity.
2. A tendency toward monogamy.
3. A tendency toward simple family structure based on the nuclear family.
4. A greater tendency for marriage to be companionate and based on mutual affection of the partners.
5. A de-emphasis on extended kinship relationships and its correlative, a relative lack of ethnocentrism.
6. A tendency toward individualism and all of its implications: individual rights against the state, representative government, moral universalism, and science.

My background is in the field of evolutionary biology, and one of the first questions that struck me when I was exposed to the evolutionary theory of sex was "why are Western cultures monogamous?" The evolutionary theory of sex is quite simple: Females must invest greatly in reproduction pregnancy, lactation, and often childcare require an extraordinary amount of time. As a result, the reproduction of females is highly limited. Even under the best of conditions women could have, say, 20 children. But the act of reproduction is cheap for men. As a result, males benefit from multiple mates, and it is expected that males with wealth and power should use their wealth and power to secure as many mates as possible. In short, intensive polygyny by wealthy, powerful males is an optimal male strategy i.e., it is behavior that optimizes individual male reproductive success.

This theory is well supported. There are strong associations between wealth and reproductive success in traditional societies from around the world. Wealthy, powerful males are able to control very large numbers of females. The elite males of all of the traditional civilizations around the world, including

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those of China, India, Muslim societies, the New World civilizations, ancient Egypt and ancient Israel, often had hundreds and even thousands of concubines. In sub-Saharan Africa, women were generally able to rear children without male provisioning, and the result was low-level polygyny in which males competed to control as many women as possible. In all of these societies, the children from these relationships were legitimate. They could inherit property and were not scorned by the public. The Emperor of China had thousands of concubines, and the Sultan of Morocco is in the *Guinness Book of World Records* as having 888 children.

To be sure, there are other societies where monogamy is the norm. It is common to distinguish ecologically imposed monogamy from socially imposed monogamy. In general, ecologically imposed monogamy is found in societies that have been forced to adapt to very harsh ecological conditions such as deserts and arctic conditions.[1] Under such harsh conditions, it is impossible for males to control additional females because the investment of each male must be directed to the children of one woman. The basic idea is that under harsh conditions a woman would be unable to rear children by herself but would require provisioning from a male. If these conditions persisted for an evolutionarily significant time, one might expect to find that the population would develop a strong tendency toward monogamy. In fact, one might imagine that the tendency toward monogamy could become so strong that it would result in psychological and cultural tendencies toward monogamy even in the face of altered ecological conditions. Later I will propose that this is exactly what happened in the evolution of Europeans.

Richard Alexander used the term "socially imposed monogamy" (SIM) to refer to situations where monogamy occurs even in the absence of harsh ecological conditions.[2] Harsh conditions imply that men are needed to directly provision children, but in other situations we expect and generally find that males compete to have as many wives as they can command.

The First Example of Western Uniqueness

Whereas all of the other economically advanced cultures of the world have been typified by polygyny by successful males, Western societies beginning with the ancient Greeks and Romans and extending up to the present have had a powerful tendency toward monogamy.

Ancient Rome had a variety of political institutions and ideological supports that tended toward monogamy.[3] The origins of socially imposed monogamy in Rome are lost in history, but there were several mechanisms for maintaining monogamy, including laws that lowered the legal status of offspring born outside monogamous marriage, customs opposing divorce,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

negative social attitudes toward non-conforming sexual behavior, and a religious ideology of monogamous sexual decorum. Variations of these mechanisms have persisted throughout Western history down to the present.

During the period of the Roman Republic, there were also mechanisms that prevented political despotism by any one aristocratic family, including term limits on the consulship, having two consuls concurrently. Legal requirements for the political representation of the lower orders gradually developed e.g., the Tribune of the Plebes. There were also extensive laws that prevented close relatives from marrying. These laws prevented the concentration of wealth within kinship groups and thus prevented the predominance of any one aristocratic family.[4]

Roman monogamy was far from complete. This was especially so in the Empire when there was a general breakdown of the earlier family functioning due to increases in divorce, and a decline in the ideology of monogamous sexual decorum that typified the early Republic. Nevertheless, from a legal point of view, and at least in theory, Roman culture remained monogamous to the end. Polygynous marriage was never sanctioned in law, and children born outside of monogamous marriage had no inheritance rights and took the social and legal status of the mother.

Battles over monogamy became an important feature of the Middle Ages as the Catholic Church attempted to impose monogamy on elite males.[5] The Catholic Church is a unique aspect of Western culture. When Marco Polo visited the Chinese in the 13th century and when Cortez arrived among the Aztecs in 1519, they found a great many similarities with their own society, including a hereditary nobility, priests, warriors, craftsmen, and peasants all living off an agricultural economy. There was thus an overwhelming convergence among the societies. But they did not find societies where the religious establishment claimed to be superior to the secular establishment and was successfully regulating the reproductive behavior of the secular elite. Nor did they find a king like Louis IX (St. Louis) who ruled France while living like a monk with his one wife and went on a Crusade to free the Holy Land.

The Catholic Church was the heir to Roman civilization where monogamy was ingrained in law and custom, and during the Middle Ages it took it upon itself to impose monogamy on the emerging European aristocracy. To be sure, the level of polygyny found among European aristocrats in the early Middle Ages was quite low compared to the harems of China and the Muslim countries, but that may well have been due partly to the relatively undeveloped economic situation of the early Middle Ages. After all, the emperor of China presided over a vast and populous country with huge surplus economic production. They were much wealthier than the tribal chieftains of early medieval Europe, and they used that wealth and power to obtain vastly more women.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In any case, polygyny did exist in Europe, and during the Middle Ages it became the object of conflict between the Church and the aristocracy. The Church was "the most influential and important governmental institution [of Europe] during the medieval period" and a major aspect of this power over the secular aristocracy involved the regulation of sex and reproduction.[6] The result was that the same rules of sexual conduct were imposed on both rich and poor. The program of the Church "required above all that laymen, especially the most powerful among them, should submit to the authority of the Church and allow it to supervise their morals, especially their sexual morals. It was by this means, through marriage, that the aristocracy could be kept under control. All matrimonial problems had to be submitted to and resolved by the Church alone."[7]

Attempting to understand the behavior of the Church during this period in terms of evolutionary psychology is beyond the scope of this paper.[8] However, one might note that the desire for power is a human universal but, like all human desires, it need not be linked with reproductive success. In the same way, people desire sex, but engaging in sex does not necessarily lead to having lots of children even though Mother Nature designed it that way.

One unique feature of the Church is that its popularity was aided by the image (and reality) that the Church was altruistic. The medieval Church successfully portrayed the image that it was not concerned with controlling women or having a high level of reproductive success. This was not always the case. Before the reforms of the Middle Ages, many priests had wives and concubines. Writing of the French Church in 742, Saint Boniface complained to the pope about "so-called deacons who have spent their lives since boyhood in debauchery, adultery, and every kind of filthiness, who entered the diaconate with this reputation, and who now, while they have four or five concubines in their beds, still read the gospel."[9]

Nevertheless, reform among the clergy was real. No English prelate of the 13th century is known to have had a wife or family. Married clergy even at lower levels were exceptional during this period in England, and low levels of clerical incontinence continued into the Reformation period.

The Church therefore projected the image of chastity and altruism. Its power and wealth were not directed at reproductive success. True reproductive altruism appears to have been a factor in the very widespread attraction of extremely ascetic monastic lifestyles. This asceticism was an important part of the public's perception of the Church during the high Middle Ages. During the 11th and 12th centuries thousands of monasteries were founded. Composed of celibate and ascetic males and recruited mainly from the more affluent classes, monasteries "set the tone in the spirituality of the whole church, in education and in art, [and] in the transmission of culture . . ."[10] The image of monastic altruism was also fostered by an ideology in which the prayers of monks were believed to aid all Christians.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These orders provided a very popular public image of the Church. During the 13th century, mendicant friars (Dominicans, Franciscans) were instrumental in reforming the Church to extend the power of the Pope over the Church, to enforce rules on clerical celibacy, to prevent nepotism and simony (the buying and selling of Church offices), and to give the Church substantial power over secular powers, including the ability to regulate sexual relationships. "The voluntary poverty and self-imposed destitution that identified the early Mendicants with the humblest and most deprived sections of the population, in loud contrast to the careerism and ostentation of the secular clergy and the corporate wealth and exclusiveness of the monasteries, moved the conscience and touched the generosity of commercial communities."[11]

> It is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the whole of history that in the high middle ages . . . many members of the highest and wealthiest or at least prosperous strata of society, who had the best chances of enjoying earthly pleasures to the full, renounced them. . . The flow of new candidates was particularly impressive in those places where the rules of monastic life had been restored to their ancient strictness, imposed more rigorously or even redefined more severely. . . We must assume that the main motive for the choice of a monastic life was always the eschatological ideal of monasticism, even if this may have lost something of its driving force in the course of a long life or was mixed with other motives from the start.[12]

During the 13th century, the mendicant friars were typically recruited from the aristocracy, the landed gentry, and other affluent families. Their parents often disapproved of their decision, presumably because, like more parents, they wanted grandchildren. "It was a nightmare for well-to-do families that their children might become friars."[13] These families began to avoid sending their children to universities because of well-founded fears that they would be recruited into a religious life.

At the center of society was an institution with an ideology that people ought to be altruistic, that they ought to be celibate even when they were born to wealth. This explains popular acceptance of the authority of the church in matters of marriage and sex, but it still makes one wonder why these well-off people were entering monasteries and becoming celibate in the first place. Like it or not, whatever else one might say about Western Europe during this period, eugenics was not a part of the picture.

The medieval Church was a unique feature of Western culture, but a theme of this paper is that in critical ways it was most un-Western. This is because medieval Europe was a collectivist society with a strong sense of group identification and commitment, and I will be arguing that Western societies are also unique in their commitment to individualism—that in fact individualism is a defining feature of Western civilization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The collectivism of Western European society in the late Middle Ages was real. There was intense group identification and group commitment to Christianity among all levels of society, as indicated, for example, by the multitudes of pilgrims and the outpouring of religious fervor and in-group fervor associated with the Crusades to free the Holy Land from Muslim control. The medieval Church had a strong sense of Christian group economic interests *vis-à-vis* the Jews, and often worked vigorously to exclude Jews from economic and political influence and to prevent social intercourse between Christians and Jews.[14]

As described above, there were also high levels of reproductive altruism, particularly among the mendicant friars, many other religious personnel, and eventually the secular elite. Reproductive altruism among the secular elite was mainly the result of coercion but there are also cases of voluntary restraint, as in the case of Louis IX of France—St. Louis. St. Louis was not only a paragon of proper Christian sexual behavior. He also had a powerful sense of Christian group economic interests *vis-à-vis* the Jews and he was heavily involved in the crusades to return the Holy Land to Christian control.[15] Europeans considered themselves part of a Christian in-group arrayed against non-Christian out-groups (particularly Muslims and Jews) who were seen as powerful and threatening enemies.[16]

There were indeed gaps between the ideal of a unified Christian society based on the power of the Church and sexual restraint among the elite. But these gaps must be balanced by the recognition that many medieval Christians, and especially the central actors in medieval society such as: The monastic movements, the mendicant friars, the reforming popes, the fervent Crusaders, the pious pilgrims, and even many elite aristocrats, saw themselves to be part of a highly unified, supranational collectivity. It is this fundamentally collectivist orientation—so foreign to contemporary Western life—that renders the high levels of group commitment and altruism characteristic of the medieval period comprehensible in psychological terms.

Social Controls & Ideology Maintaining Socially Imposed Monogamy in Western Europe

In Western Europe the Church adopted an ecclesiastical model of marriage that was diametrically opposed to the reproductive interests of the aristocracy. As a direct result of these efforts, there was a transformation of family structure and the social imposition of monogamy by the Christian Church by the end of the 12th century. The following factors appear to have been most important in the imposition and maintenance of monogamy:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prohibitions on Divorce. Wealthy males benefit most by being able to divorce easily because they can more easily remarry. While divorce was common in other Eurasian societies and was legal among the pre-Christian tribes of Europe, the Church's point of view was that marriage was monogamous and indissoluble. Divorce became ever more restricted under the Christian Roman emperors, and between the 9th and the 12th century the Church engaged in a successful conflict with the aristocracy centering around a series of divorce cases involving the nobility. For example, in the late 12th century, King Phillip of France was prevented from divorcing his wife even though he disliked her and she was infertile. The king had to apologize to a group of religious personnel at an abbey in Paris.

At times divorce was allowed, but only if the goal was to obtain a male heir in cases where the first marriage had failed to produce one e.g., Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine in Medieval France. (But the Pope did not allow Henry VIII to divorce his wife even though they did not produce a son.) Divorce "was virtually impossible except for a handful of the very rich" in England until the reform of 1857. But even then divorce rates remained very low. "In those parts of Europe that had legalized divorce in the sixteenth century, it was three hundred years and more before any line of divorce could be distinguished from the horizontal axis of a graphic depiction of divorce rates." In England the divorce rate remained at less than 0.1/1000 marriages until 1914 and less than 1/1000 until 1943 (Stone 1990); in 1910 no European country had a divorce rate higher than .5/1000 population. So far as I know, this powerful tendency in opposition to divorce is unique to Western European civilization.

Penalties for Illegitimacy. From an evolutionary perspective, the most crucial aspect of social controls related to reproduction is the control of concubinage. Controls on illegitimacy oppose the reproductive interests of wealthy males by making concubinage difficult or impossible and by affecting the prospects of illegitimate children by, e.g., preventing them from inheriting property.

The Church was actively opposed to concubinage, especially concubinage in the presence of a legitimate wife. It would appear that social controls on the abilities of illegitimate children to inherit were often effective. Church held the attitude that legitimate marriage produced legitimate children and that others had no legal standing, although in certain periods bastards had more standing than others (see below). The estates of bastards were subject to confiscation by the Church or the state, so that even if a man wanted to leave property to a bastard his wishes could be thwarted by the authorities. Bastards disappeared from wills altogether during the Puritan era in England.

Besides direct Church influence, there were a variety of other penalties attached to illegitimate birth arising from the secular authorities and public opinion. Being the father and especially the mother of an illegitimate child were causes for ostracism and jail, and it was common for the woman to take every effort to conceal the pregnancy, including leaving the area. These social

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

controls had effects on mortality of illegitimate children. Infant mortality was higher for illegitimate children in both early modern England and France. Women often abandoned illegitimate children. Illegitimate children were often reported as stillborn, indicating infanticide, and women sometimes sought to avoid bearing illegitimate children via abortion.

Controls on Concubinage among the Elite. Controls on concubinage by elite males became increasingly effective during the Middle Ages. The 12th century thus appears to be pivotal. There are good examples from this period of elite males who were able to avoid social and ideological controls favoring monogamy as well as examples where such individuals were entirely monogamous. The general patterns may be perceived by considering the illegitimate fertility of English kings. Ten of the 18 kings who ruled England from 1066 to 1485 are known to have taken mistresses, and are known to have fathered 41 illegitimate offspring who can be identified with a fair degree of certainty. Henry I, who ruled from 1100 to 1135 sired 20 of these, and 5 more are listed as probable. No other Medieval king sired more than 3, and no certain illegitimate children are recorded for 8 of the kings. Henry I is unique in his apparent interest in obtaining large numbers of offspring to further his territorial ambitions. However, Henry treated his illegitimate children far less well than his legitimate children, the latter being pampered, tutored at court, and prepared for life as great nobles. Bastards, on the other hand, were excluded from inheriting the throne, and they were often not offered marriages. Reflecting the general change in attitudes and practices related to marriage occurring in the 12th century, there is a decline in both the numbers and importance of illegitimate children in the following centuries.

Policing Sexual Behavior in the Middle Ages and Later. One of the prime goals of the medieval Church was to police sexual behavior outside of monogamous marriage Policing sexual violations was an important function of the ecclesiastical courts beginning in the Middle Ages and extending at least to the end of the 17th century. These courts were very active in 17th century England prosecuting cases of fornication, adultery, incest, and illicit cohabitation. Although the effectiveness of these ecclesiastical sanctions varied by region and period, there were examples of devastating consequences in which “the victim was hounded by his fellows, deprived of his living by a community boycott, and treated as an outcast”.

In the 17th century the ability of the High Commission of the Ecclesiastical Court system to impose sanctions, including sanctions for adultery, on the propertied who could expect to be immune from other judicial processes: “This enforcement of equality before the law did not endear the court to those who mattered in seventeenth-century England”.[17] The secular authorities, such as justices of the peace, also stood ready to prosecute such offenses. For example, pursuant to Elizabethan statutes, Justices of the Peace in the 16th and 17th

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centuries commonly sentenced sexual offenders of both sexes to a public whipping while stripped to waist (the woman "until her back be bloody") and placed in the stocks.[18]

Ideologies Promoting Monogamy. Although ultimately relying on social controls, the Medieval Church developed elaborate ideologies to promote monogamy and sexual restraint. In general these writings emphasized the moral superiority of celibacy and the sinfulness of extra-marital sex of any kind. All sexual relationships, apart from monogamous marriage, were universally condemned by religious authority throughout the early modern period into contemporary times. Marital sex was viewed as a regrettable and sinful necessity, and excess passion towards one's wife was considered adultery. While there was a relative relaxation of attitudes during the 18th century, a powerful anti-hedonist religious sexual ideology rose to prominence in the 19th century.

Conclusion. Beginning in the Middle Ages an elaborate system of social controls and ideologies resulted in the more or less complete imposition of monogamy in large areas of Western Europe. "The great social achievement of the early Middle Ages was the imposition of the same rules of sexual and domestic conduct on both rich and poor. The King in has palace, the peasant in his hovel: neither was exempt."[19] Nevertheless, the system was by no means completely egalitarian. There was a positive association between wealth and reproductive success throughout pre-industrial Europe.

In Western Europe there has been a remarkable continuity within a varied set of institutions, which have penalized polygyny and channeled non-monogamous sexuality into non-reproductive outlets or suppressed it altogether. Despite changes in these institutions and despite vast changes in political and economic structures, Western family institutions deriving ultimately from Roman civilization have clearly aimed at the social imposition of monogamy. By and large, this effort has been successful.

Effects of Monogamy

Monogamy is a very central aspect of Western uniqueness with some important effects. Monogamy may well be a necessary condition for the unique European "low-pressure" demographic profile.[20] This demographic profile results from late marriage and celibacy of large percentages of females during times of economic scarcity. The connection with monogamy is that monogamous marriage results in a situation where the poor of both sexes are unable to mate, whereas in polygynous systems an excess of poor females merely lowers the price of concubines for wealthy males. For example, at the end of the 17th century approximately 23% of both sexes remained unmarried between ages 40–44. But, as a result of altered economic opportunities, this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

percentage dropped at the beginning of the 18th century to 9%, and there was a corresponding decline in age of marriage. Like monogamy, this pattern was unique among the stratified societies of Eurasia.[21]

In turn, the low-pressure demographic profile appears to have had economic consequences. Not only was the marriage rate the main damper on population growth, but this response, especially in England, had a tendency to lag well behind favorable economic changes so that there was a tendency for capital accumulation during good times rather than a constant pressure of population on food supply:

> The fact that the rolling adjustment between economic and demographic fluctuations took place in such a leisurely fashion, tending to produce large if gradual swings in real wages, represented an opportunity to break clear from the low-level income trap which is sometimes supposed to have inhibited all pre-industrial nations. A long period of rising real wages, by changing the structure of demand, will tend to give a disproportionately strong boost to demand for commodities other than the basic necessities of life, and so to sectors of the economy whose growth is especially important if an industrial revolution is to occur.[22]

There is therefore some reason to suppose that monogamy, by resulting in a low-pressure demographic profile, was a necessary condition for industrialization. The overall pattern, then, is not one in which there is a constant tendency toward late marriage and/or celibacy in females. Instead, marriage is influenced by economic constraints. In times of prosperity the age of marriage for both sexes declined and fewer females remained non-reproductive. The result was a marriage system which is highly sensitive to resource availability: "An important distinguishing feature of Europe, the pivot upon which the system turned, was the flexible marital regime, which allowed population to adjust to economy."[23] This suggests that monogamy may indeed be a central aspect of the necessary architecture of Western modernization.

Monogamy and investment in children. Polygynous mating systems tend to result in resources being devoted to reproduction and relatively less to investment in children. For a male in a polygynous society it is attractive to invest in another wife or concubine and her low investment offspring.[24] In polygynous societies, investment in additional concubines tends to have a large payoff and requires little investment in children. Offspring of concubines were typically given relatively small inheritances and allowed to descend the social ladder. There is a low sex ratio of offspring among harem women—a preponderance of daughters.[25] In theoretical terms this implies a bias toward low investment offspring because in general it is easier for females to be able to mate.[26] Although the daughters of these concubines will have low social status compared to their father, they will tend to mate. On the other hand, sons of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upper classes were targets of dowry competition for lower status families. In either case, there is little need for fathers to invest time, energy, or money in the offspring of their concubines.

Monogamy, however, restricts the investment of individual males to the offspring of one woman. With the decline in extended kinship relations (see below) and the institutionalization of monogamy on all social classes, support for children came to rest completely upon the independent nuclear family. As described below, this "simple" family was the critical vehicle of Western modernization.

Decline of Extended Kinship Relations and the Rise of the Simple Household

As in the case of monogamy, the Church also had a role in the decline of extended kinship relationships. In this case, however, Church policy was aided by the rise of strong central governments, which discouraged extended family relationships and replaced the role of the extended family in guaranteeing individual interests.

From an evolutionary perspective one can scarcely overestimate the potential importance of kinship relationships. Because of the ties of biological relatedness, kin are expected to have common interests and lower thresholds for cooperation and even self-sacrificing behavior. The Germanic tribes who settled much of Western Europe at the end of the Roman Empire were organized as kinship groups based on biological relatedness among males. They tribes had a strong sense of group solidarity based on these ties of kinship. "Since the early Germans could not rely upon the protection and assistance of a bureaucratic empire when they were threatened with attack or famine, it was incumbent upon each man and woman of the community to adhere to the fundamental sociobiological principle of group survival embodied in the bonds of familial and communal solidarity."[27] It was this world of tribally based kinship groups that the kings and the Church wanted to eradicate.

Forces Opposing Extended Kinship. The eradication of large, powerful kinship groups was in the interests of both the Church and the aristocracy. A higher degree of centralized state power by itself has a tendency to lessen the importance of extended kinship relations, especially if that power protects the interests of individuals. From an evolutionary perspective, extended kinship groups have costs and benefits. The benefits accrue from the protection and support provided by the wider kindred, but these benefits entail costs in terms of: 1.) increased demands by kin for reciprocated services; 2.) the fact that kin will tend to prevent any individual from rising too much above the others in the kinship group; and 3) the difficulty of establishing oneself in a kinship structure which is far from egalitarian. As a result, individuals are expected to avoid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becoming enmeshed in extended kinship groups when their interests are protected by other institutions i.e., the benefits of extended kinship are removed, but the costs remain. In general individuals tend to seek the protection of the extended kinship group when centralized power fails, and they correspondingly flee the extended kinship group when state power is sufficient to protect their interests.[28]

The picture one gets is the gradual development in the West of an aristocracy based on the simple family and freed from obligations to collateral kin dominating a peasantry characterized by the simple family and embedded in a society of neighbors and friends, not an extended kinship group. This social structure was an achievement of the late Middle Ages. Extended kinship relations were not important among the peasantry in late Medieval England or France.[29]

Church Policy. For its part, the Church contributed to the eradication of extended kinship ties in Western Europe by opposing consanguineous marriage (marriage of blood relatives) and supporting marriage based solely on consent of the partners. In the case of consanguinity, the Church prohibited marriage between an ever-expanding set of individuals. In the sixth century the prohibition was extended to second cousins and by the eleventh century it was extended to 6th cousins i.e., individuals with a common great-great-great-great-great grandfather. Clearly these prohibitions on consanguinity go far beyond those predicted by evolutionary theory.[30] Moreover, biological relatedness was not crucial here, since marriage was forbidden to similarly distant affinal relatives (i.e., relatives by marriage) as well as to individuals with spiritual kinship (i. e., relatives of godparents). The effect of the policy was to undermine extensive kinship networks and to create an aristocracy freed from obligations to the wider kin group.

Whatever the rationale given to these prohibitions by the Church, there is evidence that the aristocracy obeyed the ecclesiastical rules. There were very few marriages closer than 4th or 5th cousins among the French nobility of the 10th and 11th centuries.[31] These practices weakened the extended kinship group, since the expanded range of incestuous marriages prevented the solidarity of extended kinship groups by excluding "the reinforcing of blood with marriage."[32] The result was that biological relatedness was spread diffusely throughout the nobility rather than concentrated at the top. The direct descendants of the family rather than the wider kinship group also benefitted: "Men in high secular positions . . . strove to consolidate their fortunes and their families in order to secure as much as possible for their direct descendants to the detriment of wider kin."[33]

In addition to its policy on consanguinity, the Church's doctrine of consent in marriage acted as a force against extended kinship relationships. "The family, the tribe, the clan, were subordinated to the individual. If one wanted to marry enough, one could choose one's own mate and the Church would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vindicate one's choice."[34] Marriage came about as a result of consent and was ratified by sexual intercourse. By removing the fundamental nature of marriage from the control of the family and the secular lord to the individuals involved, the Church established its authority against the traditional ties of kinship and family. Freedom of choice of marriage partner was the rule in England throughout the modern period and that parental control was exercised only in the top 1% of the population.[35]

An Ethnic Basis for Western Individualism

The Magian [Eastern] man is but part of a pneumatic "We" which, descending from above, is one and the same in all members. As body and soul he belongs to himself alone, but something else, something alien and higher, dwells in him, making him with all his glimpses and convictions just a member of a consensus, which, as the emanation of God, excludes all possibility of the self-asserting Ego. Truth is for him something other than for us i.e., for us of specifically European mentality. All our epistemological methods, resting upon the individual judgment, are for him madness and infatuation and its scientific results a work of the Evil One, who has confused and deceived the spirit as to its true dispositions and purposes. Herein lies the ultimate, for unapproachable secret of Magian though in its cavern world — the impossibility of a thinking, believing, and knowing Ego is the presupposition in all the fundamentals of all these religions.

> The Faustian Worldview: "In Wolfran von Eschenback, Cervantes, Shakespeare, and Goethe, the tragic line of the individual life develops from within outward, dynamically, functionally." " . . . willing to question even God if the mask that he shows — or is said to have shown—rings hollow when struck," Oswald Spengler.[36]

Thus far one might suppose that the creation of the individualistic nuclear family based on consent and love, monogamy, and the decline in the importance of extended kinship is simply the result of the social processes I have mentioned. But the fact is that these changes occurred much more quickly and much more thoroughly than in other parts of the world. The Western world remains the only culture area fundamentally characterized by all of the markers of individualism: Monogamy, the conjugal nuclear family, representative government with individual rights against the state, moral universalism, and science. Further, this culture was built on the robust base of Roman civilization, which had several of these features. I suggest therefore that these tendencies are unique to the Western European culture area and that they have an ethnic basis. I do not suppose that Western Europeans have any unique biological adaptations, only that we differ in degree in adaptations characteristic of all humans and that the differences are sufficient to enable the evolution of a unique human culture. Similarly, all humans have the distinctively human mental abilities like symbolic representation and language,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but races show quantitative differences in IQ sufficient to have major effects on their cultures—perhaps sufficient to result in at least some qualitative differences.

I suggest that over the course of their recent evolution, Europeans have been less subjected to between-group natural selection than Jews and other Middle Eastern populations. This was originally proposed by Fritz Lenz, who suggested that, because of the harsh environment of the Ice Age, the Nordic peoples evolved in small groups and have a tendency toward social isolation.[37] Such a perspective would not imply that Northern Europeans lack collectivist mechanisms for group competition, but only that these mechanisms are relatively less elaborated and/or require a higher level of group conflict to trigger their expression.

This perspective is consistent with ecological theory. Under ecologically adverse circumstances, adaptations are directed more at coping with the adverse physical environment than at competing with other groups, and in such an environment, there would be less pressure for selection for extended kinship networks and highly collectivist groups.[38] Evolutionary conceptualizations of ethnocentrism emphasize the utility of ethnocentrism in-group competition. Ethnocentrism would thus be of no importance at all in combating the physical environment, and such an environment would not support large groups.

European groups are part of the North Eurasian and Circumpolar culture area.[39] This culture area derives from hunter-gatherers adapted to cold, ecologically adverse climates. In such climates there is pressure for male provisioning of the family and a tendency toward monogamy because the ecology did not support either polygyny or large groups for an evolutionarily significant period. These cultures are characterized by bilateral kinship relationships which recognize both the male and female lines, suggesting a more equal contribution for each sex as would be expected under conditions of monogamy. There is also less emphasis on extended kinship relationships and marriage tends to be exogamous i.e., outside the kinship group. All of these characteristics are opposite those found in the Middle Old World culture area, comprising the lower part of Eurasia. This culture group includes Jews and similar Near Eastern groups.

This scenario implies that Northern European peoples are more prone to individualism because they existed for a very long period in an ecological context that did not support large tribal groups based on extended kinship relations. Based on mitochondrial DNA, around 80% of European genes are from people who arrived in Europe from the Middle East 30–40,000 years ago.[40] These populations persisted through the Ice Ages. Presumably European populations who evolved in the cold and cloudy environments of the North for 40,000 years developed not just blond hair and blue eyes but temperaments and life style preferences to go with it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These populations were hunters and gatherers, not agriculturalists. Because of the relatively low level of economic production, hunting favors male provision of females.[41] This is because the energetic requirements of the human brain can only be met with a high quality diet. The human brain makes up only 2% of body mass but requires 20% of all energy, 70% in the fetal period. This then led to pair bonding—the psychological basis of monogamy—in which there is cooperation between nurturing females and provisioning males beginning around 500,000 years ago. Hunting also required "considerable experience, quality education, and years of intensive practice"[42]—in other words, it requires high-investment parenting. It also pulls for intelligence because hunting for humans relies on cognitive abilities rather than running ability or strength. The hunting scenario is complex and ever changing.[43] Every animal species as well as individuals demonstrate unique behavioral characteristics depending on internal conditions of sex, age, weather, topography, etc. All of these trends are intensified in Northern areas because there is less energy per unit area.

The historical evidence shows that Europeans, and especially Northwest Europeans, were relatively quick to abandon extended kinship networks and collectivist social structures when their interests were protected with the rise of strong centralized governments. There is a general tendency throughout the world for a decline in extended kinship networks with the rise of central authority.[44] But in the case of Northwest Europe this tendency quickly gave rise, at least by the late Middle Ages and probably earlier, to the unique Western European "simple household" type. The simple household type is based on a single married couple and their children. This household style was typical of Scandinavia (except Finland), British Isles, Low Countries, German-speaking areas, northern France. It contrasts with the joint family structure typical of the rest of Eurasia in which the household consists of two or more related couples, typically brothers and their wives.[45] Before the industrial revolution, the simple household system was characterized by late age of marriage as well as methods of keeping unmarried young people occupied as servants and circulating among the households of the wealthy. The joint household system was characterized by earlier age of marriage for both men and women, a higher birthrate, as well as means of splitting up to form two or more households when the need arises.[46]

This simple household system is a fundamental feature of individualist culture. The individualist family was able to pursue its interests freed from the obligations and constraints of extended kinship relationships and free of the suffocating collectivism of the social structures typical of the rest of the world. Marriage based on individual consent and conjugal affection quickly replaced marriage based on kinship and, even considerations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This relatively greater proneness to forming a simple household type is likely ethnically based. Not only does the simple household make compelling ecological sense for people adapted to harsh climates, but as previously pointed out, this tendency is stronger among the Germanic peoples. It is an intriguing finding that there are major differences within France corresponding to the division between the Germanic peoples who lived northeast of "the eternal line," which connects Saint Malo on the English Channel with Geneva in French-speaking Switzerland. This area developed large-scale agriculture capable of feeding the growing towns and cities, and did so prior to the agricultural revolution of the 18th century. It was supported by a large array of skilled craftsmen in the towns, and a large class of medium-sized ploughmen who "owned horses, copper bowls, glass goblets and often shoes; their children had fat cheeks and broad shoulders, and their babies wore tiny shoes. None of these children had the swollen bellies of the rachitics of the Third World."[47] The northeast became the center of French industrialization and world trade.

The northeast also differed from the southwest in literacy rates. In the early 19th century, while literacy rates for France as a whole were approximately 50%, the rate in the northeast was close to 100%, and differences occurred at least from the 17th century. Moreover, there was a pronounced difference in stature, with the northeasterners being taller by almost two centimeters in an 18th century sample of military recruits. Ladurie notes that the difference in the entire population was probably larger because the army would not accept many of the shorter men from the southwest. Family historians have noted that the trend toward the economically independent nuclear family was more prominent in the north, while there was a tendency toward joint families as one moves to the south and east.[48]

These findings strongly suggest that ethnic differences are a contributing factor to the geographical variation in family forms within Europe. The findings suggest that the Germanic peoples had a somewhat greater biological tendency toward individualism—a greater tendency toward nuclear family social structure because of selection occurring in a prolonged resource-limited period of their evolution in the north of Europe. These groups were less attracted to extended kinship groups, so that when the context altered with the decline of extended kinship networks, the simple household structure occurred quickly. This simple family structure was adopted relatively easily because this group already had relatively powerful psychological predispositions toward the simple household system resulting from its unique evolutionary history.

Although these differences between the Germanic peoples and other areas of Europe system are important, they do not belie the general difference between Western Europe and the rest of Eurasia. Although the trends toward simple households and the demographic transition occurred first in the northwest of Europe, they spread relatively quickly among all the Western countries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another element of Western uniqueness was the custom of placing young people from peasant families as servants in the homes of others in areas of Northwest Europe characterized by the simple family. Between 30 and 40% of the youth in pre-industrial England were in service, the largest single occupational group until the 20th century.[49] The practice of taking in servants went beyond simply providing for one's needs by bringing in outsiders. People would sometimes have their children go to work as servants elsewhere while at the same time taking in unrelated servants.[50] It was not just the children of the poor and landless who became servants, but even large, successful farmers sent their children to be servants elsewhere. In the 17th and 18th centuries individuals often took in servants early in their marriage, before their own children could help out, and then passed their children to others when the children were older and there was more than enough help.[51]

This suggests a deeply ingrained cultural practice, which resulted in a high level of non-kinship based reciprocity. The practice also bespeaks a relative lack of ethnocentrism because people are taking in non-relatives as household members. These pre-industrial societies are not organized around extended kinship, and it is easy to see that they are pre-adapted to the industrial revolution and modern world generally. In the rest of Eurasia, there was a strong tendency for households to consist of kin.[52]

Interestingly, in a sexually competitive society such as classical China, the female servants would be concubines of the head of the household,[53] so that the resources of the household could be directly translated into reproduction. Thus in the Western European model wealthy males were supporting far more non-relatives than in the sexually competitive societies of Eurasia. It is intriguing that hunter-gatherer societies living in harsh climates often have very elaborate systems of reciprocity aimed at sharing resources such as meat. I suspect that the system of non-kinship based reciprocity so typical of pre-industrial Western Europe was another relic of a prolonged evolution in harsh northern climates.

This establishment of the simple household freed from enmeshment in the wider kinship community was then followed by all the other markers of Western modernization: limited governments in which individuals have rights against the state, capitalist economic enterprise based on individual economic rights, and science as individualist truth seeking. Individualist societies develop republican political institutions and institutions of scientific inquiry that assume that groups are maximally permeable and highly subject to defection when individual needs are not met.

Individualistic Marriage: Consent, Love, and Companionship as the Basis of Marriage

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The rise of the simple household based on consent between the partners meant that personal qualities of the mate became more important compared to the situation where families are enmeshed in extended kinship relationships. In situations where the extended family reigns supreme, marriage is typically consanguineous and affected by family strategizing. In the simple household system, the personal characteristics of the mate become more important, i.e., all those characteristics on which humans choose mates, including intelligence, personality, psychological compatibility, and socioeconomic status.

While collectivist societies emphasize genealogy and degree of genetic relatedness in marriage, individualist societies tend to emphasize personal attraction, e.g., romantic love, common interests.[54] John Money has noted the relatively greater tendency of Northern European groups toward romantic love as the basis of marriage.[55] Frank Salter has suggested that Northern European groups have a number of individualistic adaptations related to sexual behavior, including a greater tendency toward romantic love and genetic rather than social control mechanisms to prevent cuckoldry.[56] At the psychological level, the evolutionary basis of individualism involves mechanisms like romantic love in which adaptive behavior is intrinsically rewarding[57] rather than imposed by family strategizing or coerced, as in collectivist cultures. It is the difference between individual courtship between freely consenting and more or less equal partners, versus institutions like the purdah of Near Eastern civilization where the woman is sequestered and controlled by her male relatives until an arranged marriage is concluded.

There has been a trend, beginning in the Middle Ages, toward the companionate marriage based on affection and consent between the partners, eventually affecting even the marriage decisions of the high aristocracy.[58] "Whereas in industrial Western societies the emotional relationship between man and wife is primary, it is not the pivot of social structure in the majority of societies."[59] Indeed, this is a general point of contrast between Eastern and Western stratified societies.[60] The idealization of romantic love as the basis of monogamous marriage has also periodically characterized Western secular intellectual movements, such as the Stoics of late antiquity and 19th-century Romanticism.[61] It's not that love and affection between mates do not exist in other societies; it is just that there is greater emphasis on this in Western societies.

Individual consent to marriage, a characteristic of Western marriage since the Middle Ages, is expected to result in individuals weighing more heavily the personal characteristics of a prospective mate. One effect of this is greater age parity in marriage partners. Relative age parity of spouses combined with a late age of marriage is a mark of the Western European system of marriage.[62] The age of marriage for women was higher in Western Europe than elsewhere in Eurasia or Africa, including peasant societies characterized by joint families.[63]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indeed, in a large English sample from 1550–1775 the average age of marriage for females fluctuated around 26 years of age until 1675, when it began a decline to slightly above 24 years of age in 1800.

Another consequence of the simple household was that affection and pair bonding became the basis of marriage. Marriage became much less a matter of political alliance between and within kinship groups or a purely economic affair, or simply an aspect of sexual competition, and became based on interpersonal attraction, including affection. Affection within marriage became a cultural norm with the rise of the simple household. The Western phenomenon of courtship (unique among the cultures of Eurasia and Africa) provided a period in which prospective mates could assess personal compatibility; in Malthus' terms, an opportunity was given for both sexes "of finding out kindred disposition, and of forming those strong and lasting attachments without which the married state is generally more productive of misery than of happiness."[64]

Individualism & the Decline in Ethnic Consciousness Among Europeans

Thus far I have sketched a scenario, which may be summarized by saying that Western Europeans are relatively non-ethnocentric because of a prolonged period of natural selection in an adverse environment where extended kinship relationships had relatively little utility. Freed from the shackles of extended kinship relationships, Westerners returned to their roots, readily adopting the simply household which set in motion all the other features of modernization: companionate marriage, individual rights against the state, representative government, moral universalism, and science. The result was an extraordinary period of creativity, conquest, and creation of wealth that continues into the present. However, one of the theses of my books on Judaism is that individualism is a poor strategy compared to cohesive group strategies. In the West, extended kinship groups were eliminated as a necessary prelude to modernization, but this did not eliminate between-group competition entirely. Beginning in the 19th century there has been competition between Jews as a collectivist, ethnically conscious group and Western individualistic elites.

Anthropologically, Jews derive from the Middle Old World Culture area. This culture area is quite the opposite from the characteristics of Western social organization. As indicated in Table 1, Judaism is collectivist and highly prone to ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and moral particularism.[65]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	European Cultural Origins	Jewish Cultural Origins
Evolutionary History	Northern Hunter-Gatherers	Middle Old World Pastoralists (Herders)
Kinship System	Bilateral; Weakly Patricentric	Unilineal; Strongly Patricentric
Family System	Simple Household	Extended Family; Joint Household
Marriage Practices	Exogamous; Monogamous	Endogamous, Consanguineous; Polygynous
Marriage Psychology	Companionate; Based on Mutual Consent and Affection	Utilitarian; Based on Family Strategizing and Control of Kinship Group
Position of Women	Relatively High	Relatively Low
Social Structure	Individualistic; Republican; Authoritarian	Democratic; Collectivistic; Charismatic Leaders
Ethnocentrism	Relatively Low	Relatively High; "Hyper-ethnocentrism"
Xenophobia	Relatively Low	Relatively High; "Hyper-xenophobia"
Socialization	Stresses Independence, Self-Reliance	Stresses Ingroup Identification, Obligations to Kinship Group
Intellectual Stance	Reason; Science	Dogmatism; Submission to ingroup Authority and Charismatic Leaders
Moral Stance	Moral Universalism: Morality is Independent of Group	Moral Particularism; Ingroup / Outgroup Morality; Is it good for the Jews?

Table 1: Contrasts between European and Jewish Cultural Forms.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A prominent theme appearing in several places in my books on Judaism is that individualistic societies are uniquely vulnerable to invasion by cohesive groups such as has been historically represented by Judaism. Recent research by evolutionary economists provides fascinating insight on the differences between individualistic cultures versus collectivist cultures. An important aspect of this research is to model the evolution of cooperation among individualistic groups.[66] People will altruistically punish defectors in a "one-shot" game—a game in which participants only interact once and are thus not influenced by the reputations of the people with whom they are interacting. This situation therefore models an individualistic culture because participants are strangers with no kinship ties. The surprising finding was that subjects who made high levels of public goods donations tended to punish people who did not, even though they incurred a cost in doing so. Moreover, the punished individuals changed their ways and donated more in future games even though they knew that the participants in later rounds were not the same as in previous rounds. The researchers suggest that people from individualistic cultures have an evolved negative emotional reaction to free riding that results in their punishing such people even at a cost to themselves—hence the term "altruistic punishment."

Essentially this research provides a model of the evolution of cooperation among individualistic peoples. Their results are most applicable to individualistic groups because such groups are not based on extended kinship relationships and are therefore much more prone to defection. In general, high levels of altruistic punishment are more likely to be found among individualistic, hunter-gather societies than in kinship-based societies based on the extended family. Their results are least applicable to groups such as Jewish groups or other highly collectivist groups which in traditional societies were based on extended kinship relationships, known kinship linkages, and repeated interactions among members. In such situations, actors know the people with whom they are cooperating and anticipate future cooperation because they are enmeshed in extended kinship networks, or, as in the case of Jews, they are in the same group.

Europeans are thus exactly the sort of groups modeled by this research: They are groups with high levels of cooperation with strangers rather than with extended family members, and they are prone to market relations and individualism.

This suggests the fascinating possibility that the key for a group intending to turn Europeans against themselves is to trigger their strong tendency toward altruistic punishment by convincing them of the moral blameworthiness of their own people. Because Europeans are individualists at heart, they readily rise up in moral anger against their own people once they are seen as free riders and therefore morally blameworthy—a manifestation of their stronger tendency toward altruistic punishment deriving from their evolutionary past

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as hunter gatherers. In making judgments of altruistic punishment, relative genetic distance is irrelevant. Free-riders are seen as strangers in a market situation; i.e., they have no familial or tribal connection with the altruistic punisher.

As a very interesting and influential European group, the Puritans exemplified this tendency toward altruistic punishment. A defining feature of Puritanism was the tendency to pursue utopian causes framed as moral issues—their susceptibility to utopian appeals to a 'higher law' and the belief that government's principal purpose is moral. New England was the most fertile ground for "the perfectibility of man creed," and the "father of a dozen 'isms'."[67] There was a tendency to paint political alternatives as starkly contrasting moral imperatives, with one side portrayed as evil incarnate—inspired by the devil. Puritan moral intensity can also be seen in their "profound personal piety"[68]—their intensity of commitment to live not only a holy life, but also a sober and industrious life.

Puritans waged holy war on behalf of moral righteousness even against their own genetic cousins. The suggestion is that this is a form of altruistic punishment found more often among cooperative hunter-gatherer groups than among groups based on extended kinship. For example, whatever the political and economic complexities that led to the Civil War, it was the Yankee moral condemnation of slavery that inspired the rhetoric and rendered the massive carnage of closely related Anglo-Americans on behalf of slaves from Africa justifiable in the minds of Puritans. Militarily, the war with the Confederacy rendered the heaviest sacrifice in lives and property ever made by Americans.[69] Puritan moral fervor and its tendency to justify draconian punishment of evil doers can also be seen in the comments of "the Congregationalist minister at Henry Ward Beecher's Old Plymouth Church in New York [who] went so far as to call for 'exterminating the German people . . . the sterilization of 10,000,000 German soldiers and the segregation of the woman."[70]

Thus the current altruistic punishment so characteristic of contemporary Western civilization: Once Europeans were convinced that their own people were morally bankrupt, any and all means of punishment should be used against their own people. Rather than see other Europeans as part of an encompassing ethnic and tribal community, fellow Europeans were seen as morally blameworthy and the appropriate target of altruistic punishment. For Westerners, morality is individualistic — violations of communal norms by free riders are punished by altruistic aggression.

On the other hand, group strategies deriving from collectivist cultures, such as Judaism, are immune to such a maneuver because kinship and group ties come first. Morality is particularistic — whatever is good for the group. There is no tradition of altruistic punishment because the evolutionary history of these groups centers around cooperation of close kin, not strangers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The best strategy to destroy Europeans, therefore, is to convince the Europeans of their own moral bankruptcy. A major theme of my book, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*,[71] is that this is exactly what Jewish intellectual movements have done. They have presented Judaism as morally superior to European civilization and European civilization as morally bankrupt and the proper target of altruistic punishment. The consequence is that once Europeans are convinced of their own moral depravity, they will destroy their own people in a fit of altruistic punishment. The general dismantling of the culture of the West, and eventually its demise as anything resembling an ethnic entity, will occur as a result of a moral onslaught triggering a paroxysm of altruistic punishment. And thus the intense effort among Jewish intellectuals to continue the ideology of the moral superiority of Judaism and its role as undeserving historical victim while at the same time continuing the onslaught on the moral legitimacy of the West.[72]

Individualist societies are therefore an ideal environment for highly collectivist, group-oriented strategies such as Judaism. It is significant that the problem of immigration of non-European peoples is not at all confined to the United States but represents a severe and increasingly contentious problem in the entire Western world and nowhere else: Only European-derived peoples have opened their doors to the other peoples of the world and now stand in danger of losing control of territory occupied for hundreds of years. And they have done so to a considerable extent as a consequence of a self-perceived moral imperative that was utilized successfully by immigration activists to attain their own ethnic aims.[73]

Western societies have traditions of individualistic humanism, which make immigration restriction difficult. In the nineteenth century, for example, the Supreme Court twice turned down Chinese exclusion acts on the basis that they legislated against a group, not an individual.[74] The effort to develop an intellectual basis for immigration restriction was tortuous; by 1920 it was based on the legitimacy of the ethnic interests of Northwestern Europeans and had overtones of racialist thinking. Both these ideas were difficult to reconcile with the stated political, moral, and humanitarian ideology of a republican and democratic society in which, as Jewish pro-immigration activists such as Israel Zangwill emphasized, racial or ethnic group membership had no official intellectual sanction. The replacement of these assertions of ethnic self-interest with an ideology of "assimilability" in the debate over the McCarran-Walter act immigration act of 1952 was perceived by its opponents as little more than a smokescreen for "racism." At the end, this intellectual tradition collapsed largely as a result of the onslaught of the intellectual movements reviewed in this volume, and so collapsed a central pillar of the defense of the ethnic interests of European-derived peoples.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One very prominent strategy for Jewish intellectuals has been to promote radical individualism and moral universalism to the point that the entire ethnic basis of the society is undermined. In other words, these movements capitalized on the fact that Western societies had already adopted a paradigm of individualism and moral universalism, and were highly prone to altruistic punishment of their own people. These movements had the collective effect of undermining remaining sources of group cohesion among Europeans while leaving intact Judaism as a highly cohesive, group-based movement. The exemplar of this strategy is the work of the Frankfurt School of Social Research, but similar comments could be made about leftist political ideology and psychoanalysis. At its simplest level, gentile group identifications are regarded as an indication of psychopathology.

Despite the decline of extended kinship and the rise of individualism, Europeans had not entirely shed all sense of being part of a larger community. In the U.S., Europeans retained a sense of peoplehood based on race well into the 20th century. This sense of peoplehood and being a member of a race was buttressed by Darwinian-inspired scholarship, which not only viewed racial differences as well-established scientific findings, but also viewed the white race as uniquely talented. But this final attempt to find a biological sense of peoplehood went into steep decline, and is now widely viewed with horror in the academic establishment, largely because of the intellectual movements I discuss in *The Culture of Critique*.[75]

Conclusion

Whether Western individualistic societies are able to defend the legitimate interests of the European-derived peoples remains questionable. The present tendencies lead one to predict that unless individualism is abandoned the end result will be a substantial diminution of the genetic, political, and cultural influence of European peoples. It would be an unprecedented unilateral abdication of such power and certainly an evolutionist would expect no such abdication without at least a phase of resistance by a significant segment of the population—presumably the more ethnocentric among us. Ironically perhaps, this reaction would emulate aspects of Judaism by adopting group-serving, collectivist ideologies and social organizations. Whether the decline of the European peoples continues unabated or is arrested, it will constitute a profound impact of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy on the development of Western societies.

Kevin MacDonald is Professor of Psychology, California State University (Long Beach), and the author of: ***A People that Shall Dwell Alone*** *(1994),* ***Separation and its Discontents*** *(1998), and* ***The Culture of Critique*** *(1998), all published by Praeger.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

End Notes

1. Alexander 1979; see Flinn & Low (1986) and MacDonald (1983) for ethnographic examples.
2. Alexander 1979.
3. MacDonald 1990.
4. Corbett 1930; Raaflaub 1986a,b; Watson 1975.
5. The following is based on MacDonald 1995.
6. Ullman 1970, 1.
7. Duby 1983, 162.
8. See MacDonald 1995.
9. In Lynch 1972a, 33.
10. Tellenbach 1993, 101.
11. Lawrence 1994, 126.
12. Tellenbach 1993, 103.
13. Tellenbach 1993, 105.
14. Cohen 1982; Cohen 1994; Jordan 1989; MacDonald 1994a 1995; Parkes 1976.
15.Chazan 1973; ; Gilchrist 1969; Jordan 1989.
16. Lynch 1992, 161–164.
17. Hill 1967, 349.
18. Marchant 1969, 224.
19.Herlihy 1985, 157.
20. Wrigley & Schofield 1981.
21. Hajnal 1965, 1983; Laslett 1983; MacFarlane 1986; Wall 1983; Wrigley & Schofield 1981.
22. Wrigley & Schofield 1981, 439; see also Hajnal 1965; MacFarlane 1986.
23. MacFarlane 1983, 33.
24. Draper & Harpending 1988.
25. Guttentag & Secord 1983.
26. Trivers 1986.
27. Russell 1994, 120.
28. Stone 1977. The protective function of the extended family is a common phenomenon in intermediate level, tribal societies as well as many peasant societies characterized by joint family structure.
29. Hanawalt 1986; Barthelemy 1988.
30. From an evolutionary perspective, marrying close relatives leads to inbreeding depression and an increased risk for genetic diseases caused by recessive genes. Many societies allow first cousin marriage and a few, such as the Jews, allow uncle-niece marriage. As discussed here, Western societies tend to be more exogamous than Near Eastern societies.
31. Bouchard 1981.
32. Goody 1983, 145; one effect of this policy, emphasized by Goody, was that families were often left without direct heirs and left their property to the Church.
33. Leyser 1979, 50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

34. Noonan 1973, 430.
35. MacFarlane 1986.
36. In Campbell 1959, Vol. 3 233–234 & Vol. 4, 553–554.
37. Lenz 1931, 657.
38. Southwood 1977, 1981
39. Burton et al., 1996.
40. Sykes 2000
41. Roebroeks 2001
42 . Roebroeks 2001, 450.
43. Frison 1998.
44. Alexander 1979; Goldschmidt & Kunkel 1971; Stone 1977
45. Hajnal 1983.
46. Hajnal 1983; Laslett (1983) further elaborates this basic difference to include four variants ranging from West, West / central or middle, Mediterranean, to East.
47. Ladurie 1987.
48. E.g., Laslett 1983.
49. Laslett 1977.
50. Hajnal 1983.
51. Stone 1977.
52. Hajnal 1983.
53. E. g., Ebrey 1986.
54. Triandis 1990.
55. Money 1980.
56. Salter 1994.
57. MacDonald 1992.
58. Brundage 1987; Hanawalt 1986; MacFarlane 1986; Stone 1977; Stone 1990.
59. MacFarlane 1986, 174.
60. Westermarck 1922.
61. E.g. Brown 1987; Brundage 1987; Corbin 1990; Porter 1982; Veyne 1987.
62. Laslett 1983.
63. See Hajnal 1965 1983; MacFarlane 1986; Malthus 1976.
64. In MacFarlane 1986, 294.
65. See MacDonald 1998 / 2002.
66. Fehr & Gächter, 2002; Henrich et al., 2001.
67. Fischer 1989, 357.
68 . Vaughn 1997, 20.
69. Phillips 1989, 477.
70. In Phillips 1999, 556.
71. MacDonald 1998 / 2002.
72. MacDonald 1998 / 2002.
73. MacDonald 1998 / 2002, Chap. 7.
74. Petersen 1955, 78.
75. MacDonald 1998 / 2002.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

References

Alexander, R. D. *Darwinism and Human Affairs*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1979.

Bouchard, C. B. "Consanguinity and noble marriages in the tenth and eleventh century," *Speculum* 56: 268–287, 1981.

Barthelemy, D. Portraits "Kinship," in *A History of Private Life*, Vol. II, P. Aries & G. Duby (eds.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Brown, P. "Late antiquity," in P. Veyne (ed.) *A History of Private Life*, Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Brundage, J. A. "Concubinage and marriage in Medieval Canon law," *Journal of Medieval History* 1: 1–17, 1975.

Burton, M. L., Moore, C. C., Whiting, J. W. M., & Romney, A. K. "Regions based on social structure," *Current Anthropology* 37: 87–123, 1996.

Campbell, J. *The Masks of God* (4 Vols.), New York: Viking, 1959.

Chazan, R. *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: A Political and Social History*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Cohen, J. *The Friars and the Jews: The Emergence of Medieval Anti-Judaism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Cohen, M. *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Corbett, P. E. *The Roman Law of Marriage*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1930.

Corbin, A. "Intimate relations," in M. Perrot (ed.) *A History of Private Life: IV. From the Fires of the Revolution to the Great War*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Draper, P., & Harpending, H. "A sociobiological perspective on human reproductive strategies," in K. MacDonald (ed.) *Sociobiological perspectives on human development*, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1988, pp. 340–372.

Duby, G. *The Knight, the Lady, and the Priest*, (trans. Barbara Bray) London: Penguin Books, 1983.

Ebrey, P. "Concubines in Sung China," *Journal of Family History*, 11: 1–24, 1986.

Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. "Altruistic punishment in humans," *Nature* 415: 137–140, 2002.

Fischer, D. H. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Flinn, M. V., & Low, B. S. "Resource distribution, social competition, and mating patterns in human societies," in D. I. Rubenstein & R. W. Wrangham (eds.) *Ecological Aspects of Social Evolution*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Frison, G. C. "Paleoindian large mammal hunters of the plains of North America," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 95: 14575–14583, 1998.

Gilchrist, J. *The Church and Economic Policy in the Middle Ages*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969.

Goldschmidt, W., & Kunkel, E. J. "The structure of the peasant family," *American Anthropologist* 73:1058–1076, 1971.

Goody, J. *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Guttentag, M., & Secord, P. F. "*Too Many Women?*" Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.

Hajnal, J. "Two kinds of pre-industrial household formation system," in *Family Forms in Historic Europe*, R. Wall, J. Robin & P. Laslett (eds.) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hanawalt, B. *The Ties that Bound: Peasant Families in Medieval England*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., & McElreath, R. "In search of *Homo economicus*: Behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies," *Economics and Social Behavior* 91: 73–78, 2001.

Herlihy, D. *Medieval Households*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Hill, J. E. C. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, (2nd ed.) New York: Schocken Books, 1967.

Jordan, W. C. *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.

Ladurie, E. L. T*he French Peasantry 1450–1660*, (trans. by A. Sheridan) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986 (Originally published in 1977).

Laslett, P. "Family and household as work group and kin group: areas of traditional Europe compared," in *Family Forms in Historic Europe*, R. Wall, J. Robin, and P. Laslett (eds.) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Laslett, P. *The World We have Lost*, (3d edition) New York: Scribners, 1984.

Lawrence, C. H. *The Friars: The Impact of the Early Mendicant Movement on Western Culture*, London: Longman, 1994.

Lenz, F. "The inheritance of intellectual gifts," in *Human Heredity*, (trans. E. Paul & C. Paul), E. Baur, E. Fischer, & F. Lenz, New York: Macmillan, 1931.

Leyser, K. J. *Rule and Conflict in Early Medieval Society*, London: E. Arnold, 1979.

Lynch, J. E. "Marriage and celibacy of the clergy: The discipline of the Western Church: An historical-canonical synopsis," *Jurist 23*:14–38; 189–212, 1972a, b.

MacDonald, K. B. "Production, social controls and ideology: Toward a sociobiology of the phenotype," *Journal of Social and Biological Structures* 6: 297–317, 1983.

MacDonald, K. B. "Mechanisms of sexual egalitarianism in Western Europe," *Ethology and Sociobiology* 11:195–238, 1990.

MacDonald, K. B. "Warmth as a developmental construct: An evolutionary analysis," *Child Development* 63:753–773, 1992.

MacDonald, K. B. *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994.

MacDonald, K. B. "The Establishment and Maintenance of Socially Imposed Monogamy in Western Europe," *Politics and the Life Sciences 14*:3–23, 1995.

MacDonald, K. B. "Focusing on the Group: Further Issues Related to Western Monogamy," *Politics and the Life Sciences 14*:38–46, 1995.

MacDonald, K. B. *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

MacDonald, K. B. *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998 (Revised edition, 2002, Bloomington, IN: 1stbooks Library).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MacFarlane, A. *Marriage and Love in England: Modes of Reproduction 1300–1840*, London: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Malthus, T. R. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, New York: W. W. Norton, 1976 (Originally published in 1798).

Marchant, R. A. *The Church under the Law*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Money, J. *Love, and Love Sickness: The Science of Sex, Gender Differences, and Pair Bonding*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Noonan, J. T. "Power to choose," *Viator* 4: 419–434, 1973.

Parkes, J. *The Jew in the Medieval Community*, (2nd ed.) New York: Hermon Press, 1976.

Petersen, W. "The "scientific" basis of our immigration policy," *Commentary 20* (*July)*: 77–86, 1955.

Phillips, K.P. *The Cousins' Wars: Religion, Politics, and the Triumph of Anglo-America*, New York: Basic Books, 1999.

Porter, R. "Mixed feelings: The Enlightenment and sexuality in eighteenth-century Britain," in P. Bouce (ed.) *Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1982.

Raaflaub, K. A. "The conflict of the orders in archaic Rome: A comprehensive and comparative approach," in K. A. Raaflaub (ed.) *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986a.

Raaflaub, K. A. "From protection and defense to offense and participation: Stages in the conflict of the orders," in K. A. Raaflaub (ed.) *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986b.

Roebroeks, W. "Hominid behaviour and the earliest occupation of Europe: An exploration," *Journal of Human Evolution* 41: 437–461, 2001.

Russell, J. C. *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Salter, F. K. "Does female beauty increase male confidence of paternity? A blank slate hypothesis," *Ethology and Sociobiology* 1994.

Southwood, T. R. E. "Habitat, the temple for ecological strategies?" *Journal of Animal Ecology 46*: 337–366, 1977.

Southwood, T. R. E. "Bionomic strategies and population parameters," in R. M. May (ed.) *Theoretical Ecology: Principles and Applications*, Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, 1981.

Stone, L. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England: 1500–1800*, New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Stone, L. *The Road to Divorce*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Sykes, B. *The Seven Daughters of Eve*, New York: Norton, 2001.

Tellenbach, G. *The Church in Western Europe From the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Triandis, H. C. "Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism," *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1989: Cross Cultural Perspectives*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.

Trivers, R. *Social Evolution*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Ullman, W. *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power*, (3rd ed.) London: Methuen, 1970.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vaughn, A. T. *The Puritan Tradition in America, 1620–1730*, (revised ed.) Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1997.

Veyne, P. "The Roman Empire," in P. Veyne (ed.) *A History of Private Life*, Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Watson, A. *Rome of the XII Tables*, Princeton University Press, 1975.

Westermarck, G. *The History of Human Marriage*, (5th ed.) New York: Allerton, 1922.

Wrigley, E. A., & Schofield, R. *The Population History of England, 1541–1871*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Remembering American Wars

'Politically Correct' Myths of Military Service

Richard Earley

Much of what Americans believe about the causes of war, national conflicts, and wartime casualties, is shaped by popular myths. The entertainment industry, mass media and mass-market publishers feed Americans a continual psychosomatic diet of fictionalized propaganda by directors such as Steven Spielberg and Oliver Stone that regularly passes as fact. Americans have been a profoundly a historical and anti-intellectual people with a deep distrust of those who remember anything more than what was on television, on the movie screen or a sports score. Yet, we continue to have an abiding conviction that we are the chosen people of the modern age and everybody wants to be just like us. The consequences of World War II from which we emerged relatively unscathed and as a superpower, which we did not merit, have largely been played out.

Many Americans persist in believing that the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor was a treachery unequalled in the annals of mankind. Yet when China, Russia, France, Great Britain and the United States convened to form the United Nations shortly after World War II, their great common bond was being attacked without warning by Japan within the preceding half century. From the sinking of the Chinese troop ship, *Kow Shing*, in 1894[1] to December 7, 1941, the knights of Bushido had not bothered to declare war before assaulting the five nations forming the Security Council of the United Nations.

The Japanese sneak attack at Port Arthur against Russia in 1904 brought respectful compliments from American cultural icons such as Teddy Roosevelt and the *New York Times*. On February 13, 1904 the *New York Times* berated the Czar of Russia: "the point that the Japanese violated international law in going to war without a formal declaration would be of no importance if the Czar had not dignified it in raising it to the Russian people" and added "the practice of initiating war by formal declaration has gone out".[2] Rough Rider Teddy wrote his son on how pleased he was by Japan's stunning duplicity at Port Arthur.[3] His sense of fair play was not affronted. While December 7, 1941 is still remembered as a day of infamy in America, no historical sense exists among most Americans that other nations have suffered similar faithless hostility. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continue to reject the lessons of history, not only our own, but especially other's, as a guide to human interaction. Americans have preferred to rely on manifest nobility and being blessed by a kindly Providence to divine human actions.

For most of human history the balance of world power has resided in the Orient, most specifically China. Perceptive observers have noted a swing back to Asia and wonder why Americans do not comment on it. In their most debilitated state the Chinese have disputed the American claim of manifest destiny. Americans have insulted the Chinese repeatedly and never realized it.

In 1995 when Japanese Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama visited Peking he was met by an accusation in the *People's Daily*, the newspaper of the Chinese government, that 35 million Chinese died due to Japanese depravity.[4] Within days the *New York Times* had an article written by their Tokyo correspondent, Pulitzer Prize winner and current op-ed columnist, Nicholas Kristof, that credited only 10 million Chinese dying due to Japanese butchery.[5] As was said in Vietnam, Mr. Kristof "disappeared" 25 million people. Who would want to quibble over dead Chinese? It must be noted this number was over four times the alleged number of Jews that were killed by the Nazis, which occurred during the same memorialized period as the Holocaust, to the exclusion of other atrocities and by most of the rest of the world as World War II. To challenge the death of one Jew is to be labeled an anti-Semite unworthy of debate, yet not a single letter was published concerning the missing 25 million. When it comes wartime atrocities, the *New York Times* considers some victims more important than others.

In May 1938, six months after the Nanking massacre, when the Japanese slaughtered 300,000 Chinese, Mao Tse Tung told Evans Carlson of the United States Marines that the U.S. had provided Japan with over half of the war materials she had purchased abroad. This news stunned Carlson, and he had to reconsider much of the bombast he had uttered in support of American policy. Mao explained to Carlson that people were sometimes so blinded by the glitter of gold that they fail to see their country or themselves accurately.[6] As a means of comparison the number of Chinese killed at Nanking was three times the number of American combat dead in what we consider 45 months of hard fighting in the Pacific in World War II.

On November 25, 1941, FDR, Secretaries Hull, Knox and Stimson, General Marshall, and Admiral Stark agonized over maneuvering the Japanese into firing the first shot without too much danger to Americans. Some 4 days previous, Secretary of War Henry Stimson brusquely observed in his diary that the Japanese had killed some 700 Chinese with poison gas at Ichang. Stimson manifested no concern for their lives, but expressed anxiety over Americans in the Philippines.[7]

The recent movie *Pearl Harbor* sharply illustrated American hypocrisy and economic ethics. Endings and scenes have been modified so as not to offend

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese sensibilities or potential profits from Japan. Chinese psychic needs were forgotten or never considered. The Doolittle Raid is presented as mighty America's answer to upstart Japan. In the days preceding the raid, Chiang Kai Shek had received reports the Japanese were massing troops at Hangchow in preparation for a march against Chuchow, the intended landing spot for Doolittle's planes. Chiang objected to the use of the Chuchow airfield as he felt using Chuchow would provoke Japanese barbarity. FDR placed American domestic considerations above Chinese lives and ordered the bombing.

After the Doolittle raid, the Japanese commander was given orders to prevent the bombing of the Japanese homeland by use of bases in China. The Japanese dispatched troops to the area and started to destroy all military targets. Murder, rape, and plunder became the every day conduct of the attacking Japanese forces. After the initial reports, Chiang fired off a bitter cable to Washington:

> Japanese troops attacked the coastal areas of China where many of the American flyers had landed. These Japanese troops slaughtered every man, woman and child in those areas - let me repeat - these Japanese troops slaughtered every man, woman and child in those areas, reproducing on a wholesale scale the horrors which the world had seen at Lidice, but about which the people have been uninformed in these instances.

Mao's reaction would have been much the same as Chiang's. Chiang did not exaggerate. The American General Claire Chennault in his memoirs outlined the Japanese revenge as their moving troops two hundred miles into east China and occupying twenty thousand square miles of Chinese territory. Entire villages were burned and all inhabitants shot. Chennault estimated the number of Chinese soldiers and civilians dead at a quarter million.[8]

Americans have managed to forget our innocent awkward attempts to civilize and modernize the Chinese. In 1847, after reading a missionary tract on Christian religion a Chinese inquisitor, Hung Hsiu-chuan presented himself to Issachar Roberts of Sumner County, Tennessee for a two-month course of intensive Bible study in Canton, China.[9] Two months would not have been sufficient for firebrands like Reverend Roberts to impart more than a superficial understanding of the Christian religion, but what Hung did learn proved to have immense consequences. The moral rigidity of the Ten Commandments and wrathful retribution of the Old Testament overwhelmed any appeal the existing Confucian ethic had for him. Not only did Hung become a believer, but came to have visions and to think of himself as the younger brother of Jesus Christ. Convinced of his righteousness, Hung began to destroy the idols of other religions, most notably the Confucian ancestor tablets. The earthly effect was to lead Hung into rebellion against the Manchu dynasty so a new social order could be created. What followed was one of the great revolutionary movements in the history of the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Taiping Rebellion has been generally dated from 1851 to 1864. The whole of central China and large parts of the North and South, altogether an area with more than a hundred million inhabitants, were affected. A generally accepted figure for the number of dead caused by the fighting was twenty million. This war lasted three times as long as the American Civil War and in China more than thirty times as many died.

When accompanying President Nixon to Peking, James Reston of the *New York Times* was aghast when he found that Chou En Lai harbored ill feelings towards the Japanese. Chou replied that China had suffered greatly from the Japanese while in comparison to both World Wars, the United States had suffered relatively little and benefited greatly. This response caused Reston, the most influential newspaperman of his generation, to examine himself. His thoughts expounded to Eric Sevareid, onetime heavyweight commentator at CBS, revealed much of American character, historical perspective and primitive insolence. Reston proudly noted Americans had as a defining quality "no memory," and this failure proved we were a forward-looking people.[10]

The Chinese have never forgotten these insults, and one must assume one day they will make sure the rest of the world does not either. This most certainly must include the U.S. The failure of Americans to appreciate history, most notably that of foreign countries, has long been a national disgrace. To understand why we do not value history we must look within ourselves.

Remembering the Civil War

The seminal event in American history has been the Civil War. Anglo-American poet T. S. Eliot said the real revolution in the United States was not what the history books referred to as the Revolutionary War, but a consequence of the Civil War after which arose a plutocratic elite.[11]

Three tribes that greatly determine present-day popular American culture, Ivy League WASP's, American blacks and Jews, evaded military service in that most crucial of American wars and have created a corrosive chimera to conceal their deceits and cowardice. As a nation, we have come to believe the necessary lies of the present-day ruling class and cultural standard bearers.

The archetype of the American tycoon of the latter part of the 19th and early 20th century was John Pierpont Morgan. As recently as 1989 a reader wrote a letter to *American Heritage* magazine asking where the great Morgan was during the years of the Civil War and if Morgan hired a substitute to go to war in his place.[12] Then the curious correspondent surmised that the then popular cliché of the Civil War as "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight" was quite true. The answer from this magazine that presents itself as concerned for the serious amateur was that they believed Morgan hired a substitute rather than serve in the army. Elaborating on the apologia, the magazine reminded readers there was just too much money to be made on Wall Street for poor Morgan to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think of anything else, and in an appeal to the patriotic ideals lurking within every American, the magazine reminded the inquiring reader of the preservation of the Union, "the last, best hope on earth", and the abolition of the abomination of slavery.

As for the rich who stayed home to make money, *American Heritage* wondered if forever more they did not hold their manhood cheap. With no obvious malice the reply finished, "Along with the money, I suspect Morgan and thousands of others paid a quiet, inward, lifelong price." That the designated replier from *American Heritage* managed to change his answer from a tentative belief in Morgan's hiring of a substitute to an acknowledgement of his paying a stand-in within two paragraphs, illustrated how the power of money warps the integrity of language when an unpleasant fact has to be faced.

This bare minimal answer bordered on deliberate deceit and pandered to the present day power of the House of Morgan. Morgan's nefarious dealings during the Civil War have been a matter of general public record since 1908 when August Myer's *The History of Great American Fortunes* was published.[13] Morgan knowingly profited enormously from the sale of defective rifles to the Union Army. This transaction in legalistic American terms was a deliberate piece of chicanery that only just stopped short of being illegal and may still bring admiring prose at both the Harvard legal and business schools. His contemporaries fighting and dying may only heighten the praise as proof of his foresight. The divinity school at Harvard might not find his behavior and moral code worthy of condemnation either.

After the battle of Gettysburg when Morgan was drafted, he did arrange to pay a substitute $300 so that he need not expose himself to danger[14]. When done on such a large scale, these briberies contributed greatly to the draft riots of 1863 when the immigrant and other lower classes reacted violently against what they perceived as an unfair quota system. The draft riots disturbed the affluent. Forty years later a history of Columbia University described the draft riot as a "formidable uprising of the unpatriotic, ignorant and vicious classes in the city."[15] The poet Ezra Pound was not impressed by Morgan's evasions, but thought they rather helped him become the great Mahatma of Wall Street where he was rather typical of the material by which economic and human history of the United States had been made.[16]

An admiring biography of the Mellons, chronicling their rise to become America's richest family, made it quite clear as to what was uppermost in Judge Mellon's mind during the Civil War years.[17] His son James had written the war was a source of great wealth to speculators who were continually getting richer and who did not care when war closed as the longer it lasted the better it would be for them. His elder son T.A. spoke ecstatically about the wealth to be made in tobacco speculations. In full recognition that his attitude was not the patriotic one, young T.A. let his actions be modeled after those in Lincoln's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cabinet and thought "the more a person can get the better." The Judge was thrilled his boy was thinking the right way and sent him a letter of congratulations as the boy's views coincided with his own. The Judge added, "There is no doubt that in a general shipwreck the best way to save one's self is to keep afloat."

His son James weakened and asked permission to enlist, but the Judge's concept of patriotism did not require enlisting in any army. The Judge remembered, with approval, how his own Uncle Thomas had evaded the British draft in his escaping North Ireland by dressing as a woman. His biographer, vowed the Judge in his memoirs, wrote his matured and tempered view on the subject:

> There may be occasions justifying war and making it the duty of every citizen to engage in it, but in the present state of civilization such occasions can seldom occur, and there is always a disproportionately large class of men fitted by nature for a service which requires so little brain work as that of the common soldier, and who are more valuable to their country and themselves as soldiers at such a time than in any other capacity. It is a mistake to suppose it the duty of every man to enlist when his country needs soldiers... If a man is wise, and can perform the duties of private life with credit to himself and improve his conditions at home, he will avoid the folly of soldiering.... a man whose life is of much value to himself, or his family should stay at home.

He added:

> [T]housands of poor, worthless fellows fit for soldiering, but fit for nothing else, whose duty is to go… In time you will come to understand and believe that a man may be patriotic without risking his own life or sacrificing his health. There are plenty of other lives less valuable or others ready to serve for the love of serving.

Could the father of Dan Quayle have said it any better?

The patriarch of the Taft family of Ohio politics was writing friends that he was ready to throw Lincoln and his cabinet into the Potomac and cudgel his generals as cowards and traitors.[18] He was beside himself for the failure of the administration to come to grips with the slavery issue. But Taft's mood changed swiftly after the Battle of Antietam when Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and he spoke with renewed enthusiasm for emancipation at patriotic rallies around Cincinnati. With two sons, one born in 1843 and one born in 1845, one might have had a small hope that these children would have been sufficiently motivated to enlist for the sake of their father's fervent beliefs. But they did not. The great battle of Chattanooga was raging in 1863 when the younger turned 18, but the younger had listened to his father's admonition: "there is no place like college to teach the value of each particular moment." He hustled off to Yale. What bullets crashing around his head, or smashing into his body could have taught the lad about appreciating other tranquil moments was not considered appropriate for the offspring of Taft, the patriarch, but he certainly was not shy in urging the children of others not so worthy to have the experience.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HARVARD AT WAR

An interesting line of inquiry has been to try to determine the extent of the war's popularity at Harvard even then a citadel of non-conformist rectitude for the New England conscience. Writing in *The New England Magazine* of March, 1891, Nathan Appleton, who a quarter of a century after the conflict still identified himself by his wartime rank of Captain, described the effect of the war on the college.[19] As a member of the class of 1863, Appleton was attending classes during some of the worst of the early fighting, and he told the reader that the proclamation abolishing slavery by President Lincoln on January 1, 1863, assured the outcome of the war before it was finished in the field. The four Southern students in his class at Harvard dropped out in 1861, and one was killed shortly thereafter. While at Harvard Appleton was thrilled to see waving flags. His first night of guard duty at the nearby arsenal gave him a sense of accomplishment and pride, and Appleton regarded this the most important military episode in Harvard's military life. What was mildly surprising and amusing was the assertion by Appleton that prior to the war the most popular song in Boston musical theaters was *Dixie*, the anthem of the South.

His greatest praise was reserved for Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, commanding officer of the 54th Massachusetts Regiment. Shaw was lauded for leading his black troops at Fort Wagner. Whatever incompetence Shaw may have displayed in tactics, which led to the awful slaughter of his troops, was excused by the glory of the greater victory of showing that men of color could fight, and if need be, die for their freedom and country. Appleton thought Shaw earned the greatest sepulchre of any soldier of the century.

Colonel Shaw by himself has served as repository for many of the bravely manifested ideals of the Harvard men. He was the sole subject of a laudatory article in the February, 1890 issue of *New England Magazine* where it was admitted while he matriculated at Harvard, he never graduated as he left to take a clerkship in a mercantile house in New York.[20] As a boy Master Robert promised his father's colored butler that after he grew up, Master Robert would fight for the butler's race. If the writer of the article of over 100 years ago is to be believed, the stern prayer for battle was ever on his lips and in his letters. His regiment, the 54th of Massachusetts, was allotted the post of honor (to use the florid language of the time) for the assault on Fort Wagner. After a charge of admittedly brave men, the sheer amateurishness and incompetence of the 54th manifested itself. Shaw and many of his black troops died. That Shaw and his troops may have been better served if a more thoughtful and professional attack had been attempted, never seemed to bother those who wrote about the martial glory of the 54th; nor, have those in Hollywood who made the film *Glory* about this charge cared to dwell on the ineptitude involved. Professor McPherson of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Princeton professed that *Glory* was the most powerful movie ever made of the Civil War and provided a cold dose of realism over romantic views of the Confederacy.[21]

The WASP hierarchy escaped the travails of the Civil War. They cowered in the campuses of Harvard and Yale. At the onset of the war, the eleven seceding states had 1,060,000 white men between the ages of 15 and 40 while the rest of the country had 4,560,000 white men using the 1860 census figures. After adjusting for southern sympathies in border states, the Confederacy had a "military age" pool of some 1,275,000 men to draw from while the Union had 4,345,000 white men plus the black potential to draw on.[22] These men would age to 20 and 45 during the war and a guess would be that they would be more than 95% of the casualties. Exact numbers are not important for the following calculations, but a sense of proportion is.

From start to finish, an estimated 900,000 men served in the Confederate Army and about 2,000,000 white men served in Union forces along with 200,000 blacks. [23] Confederacy losses were estimated at 280,000 white men. The South lost men at the rate of over 20 men per 100 from their pool. The North lost over 320,000 white men, or 7.35 men per 100 from their pool. As a nation the U.S. lost about 600,000 white men from a military aged pool of 5,620,000, or more than 10.5 per 100. In the general population the loss of almost 600,000 over a white population approaching 28,000,000 was 2.1 per 100 of the general white population. For blacks who were prohibited from fighting for much of the war their loss of 33,000 over a general population of 4,000,000 was 0.8 per 100 of their total population. When applied to their military aged population of almost 900,000 the loss was about 3.7 per 100, roughly one-third the loss of whites.

For undergraduate Harvard classes restricted to the Academic Department between 1841 and 1867 who were roughly between the ages 16 and 41 when war began and 20 and 45 when it ended, over 550 would serve and 91 would die in the service of the Union.[24] (This number included those who died while on Christian missions and with the Sanitary Commission.) Dead from the South were not considered important enough to count in 1866 when Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson compiled the below numbers for all classes.

All Harvard Classes	*Total Enlistments*	*Died in Service*
Academic Department-Grads	475	73
-Non-Grads	114	22
Total (Undergraduate)	589	95
Professional Schools	349	22
Total	938	117*

*(Union Only)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The student numbers for the undergraduate classes between 1841 and 1867 were almost 2300 graduates and 700 non-graduates, to include the illustrious Shaw, who was awarded an honorary posthumous degree in 1873. Professor McPherson referred to Shaw as an alumnus of Harvard rather than a dropout.[25] If their student population approximated that of Yale, much less than 10% came from the South. Nathan Appleton's class of 1863 had 121 graduates and 30 non-graduates with only four from the South.[26] These numbers of about 2800 men from the North would give the contribution of the Harvard men to the Union cause in the most vicious and important war in our history such that about 20% of eligible men would serve while 3.3% would die for the Union cause.

Given that Harvard did not graduate a black until after the Civil War, the Harvard dead were among the 320,000 white deaths. About 46% of eligible Northern men would serve. In both cases the Harvard contribution to the war effort was not one-half of their contemporaries in the North. If more detailed analysis were undertaken by restricting the examined men to younger age groups, the betting would be that the Harvard contribution would be seen to be less, possibly much less than their contemporaries. Care should be given to the estimate of 4 million plus eligible men, as many probably were immigrants ignorant of the conditions of war. The slackers at Harvard were not.

For the 300th anniversary of the founding of Harvard in 1936 historian Samuel Eliot Morison summarized the contribution to the Civil War in less than 3 pages. Professor Morison called the students who did guard duty at the arsenal "intrepid defenders" who drilled in a gymnasium under Professor Charles W. Eliot. Harvard had a "cool attitude" towards the war. According to Professor Morison no popular outcry for students to take up arms arose. Draftees who hired a substitute were not despised. Those at Harvard, most certainly to include Morison, did not appear to have conversed with lower white classes such as the immigrant Irish who had contrary opinions. With no condemnation he noted President Lincoln hiding his son at Harvard and then giving him a safe staff appointment. Writing over 70 years after the war ended Morison gave figures for Harvard's sons participation in the below table:[27]

	Total Enlistments	*Killed* or Died	Percent
United States Forces, 1861-65	1,311	138	10.5
Confederate Forces, 1861-65	257	64	25.0

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Morison did was to inflate the number of fatalities by adding the number of dead killed from the graduate schools and, somehow after 70 years, find those who had died in that conflict but were not recognized before. To recognize deaths years after the war and attribute the deaths to the war could be done for others who served in that war. The truly malicious part was in manipulating the percentage who had died. His numbers deliberately concealed the abject cowardice of the men of Harvard during that conflict. No feeling for lack of martial courage or sense of duty by the scholars of America's most prestigious university could be gleaned from reading those contrived dishonest figures. Excepting Southerners, the Harvard men of the North were lacking spectacularly in courage and sense of duty.

Yale in the Civil War

The figures for Yale were even more nauseating. For the classes between 1841 and 1867 the students numbered over 4200. Yale had 84 die in service to the Union and 48 die in service to the Confederacy with additional deaths of one each attributed in service to the Christian Commission and Sanitary Commission.[28] About 3% of those classes from Yale died in the war.

For Yale classes from 1841 to 1861 there was a sectional breakdown for students:[29]

	South	*North*	*Total*
Serving	166	521	687
Non-Serving	95	2477	2572
Sub-Total	261	2998	3259
Dead	43	59	102

For the classes between 1862 and 1867 there was no sectional breakdown other than deaths:[30]

Dead	5	25	30
Total Students			984

For Yale only about 2% of their classes would die for the North and only about 17% would serve in uniform. Both rates were not only well below the response of their contemporaries, but even below the slackers at Harvard. The Yalie of the South served at about a 64% rate and died at a rate of about 16%, both substantially less than his neighbors, but much higher than the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contribution by his northern classmates. Compared to the country as a whole, the men of Harvard died at much less than one-half the rate of their contemporaries. Those stalwart patriots of Yale died at less than one-third the frequency of their countrymen. Neither institution has expressed regret or shame over their cowardice.

The tome *Yale in The Civil War* was published in 1932 to note the contribution of their kind to that conflict. Ruefully admitted was the fact that most of their students had remained decidedly indifferent or lukewarm and chose to be spectators to that conflict. "In a civil war, for obvious reasons, the number of pacifists must always be large." In fact after the appalling losses of the Wilderness Campaign in 1864 student patriotism reached its lowest ebb. No more swords would be presented to students leaving college to enlist. *Yale Literary Magazine* would take no further notice of the war. They would make no mention of those who would rally to the colors, or to any event of the war. The gloom of the campus scarred the students for the rest of their lives. Little consideration was expended on those who did the fighting. The students did mobilize when confronted with an ancient enemy, the "laboring classes." The draft riots of 1863 in New York City stimulated enlistment. When the length of enlistment was changed to 90 days rather than 30, only 33 of the very finest of Yale volunteered. The desired number was 500. The terms of service were light. For 3 hours, from 4 to 7, they were to drill. Their patriotic service was to be limited only to quelling disturbances in Connecticut. A great source for this book was Mr. Eugene Smith of the class of 1859 who had been briefly expelled for participation in the death of a fireman. This youthful indiscretion did not hinder his receiving the valedictory of his class. The author failed to comment upon Mr. Smith's absence from the Civil War. Men of Yale obviously had their own code of what was really important.[31]

Some highbrows will noted that the disinclination to enlist was not limited to those of the North as a considerable number of Southerners likewise did not enlist.[32] As the above table shows, the student from the Confederacy at Yale, while not meeting the standards of his neighbors, was considerably braver than his northern classmate. In presiding at the commemorative celebration in 1865, William Evarts averred that one-quarter of Yale men of military age had served in the army of the North and proudly asked: "Who has done better than this? Who can say any class of my patriotic countrymen has done better than the students at Yale?"[33] Those who would say the Yalies shirked their duty have not been given a forum.

On June 21, 1865, the Senior Class at Yale held their valedictory. Like the Harvard ceremony, a dreadful poem was read, and the war featured prominently in the wretched prose. In the oration the convening class was remembered at the onset of war with the insult to the flag at Fort Sumter and the disastrous conflict at Bull Run.[34] The orator admitted as to how those at Yale had become accustomed, and rightly so, to think of themselves as a privileged

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class among men.[35] After congratulating his classmates on their perseverance and character, those who did sacrifice in war were remembered as absent faces. Thompson with unequalled patriotism had left the delights of a Christian home, endeared friends and classmates to assume soldier's garb. Alas, his frail frame could not endure, and he became a Christian martyr to a holy cause. The one absent comrade most fondly remembered was Corporal Alling. Scholarly, retiring and a conscientious patriot, Alling answered his country's call. In a disastrous charge at Fredericksburg, he fell among the foremost and bravest. On that auspicious graduation day his classmates recalled Alling as sleeping the long sleep in an unmarked soldier's grave. Alling carried the colors for all his classmates.[36]

Yale in the Civil War contrasted the response of Yale men to the Civil War to World War I. World War I had clear clean-cut issues that caused most of the student body to volunteer. No figures were cited. This Yale chauvinist asserted the unanimous and enthusiastic response by Yale undergraduates to the call of their country in World War I had proven they had learned the most important duty of citizenship that of unhesitatingly coming to the support of their country in time of need. That this virtue should never lapse was the ardent hope of every older alumnus.[37] This claptrap has passed for proof of courage and patriotism for years among WASPs of moneyed birth. A cynic would notice that for the Civil War in America some 20 persons per thousand in the general population died and for the Great War about one per thousand died. That the Civil War was about twenty times more dangerous did not cause any comment for those who wrote that book. Morison in writing about Harvard made much the same claim for his fellows. James McPherson, while writing in 1996, asserted appropriations by city councils and draft insurance societies allowed men who did not want to go to war to pay commutation fees. Professor McPherson baldly claimed this allowed poor men to buy their way out of the draft almost as readily as rich men.[38] These avowals are needed by McPherson and his ilk to maintain moral supremacy and legitimacy for their caste.

With guns blazing in Europe in 1915, and after a half century of contemplation, Yale dedicated a memorial to the fallen of the Civil War. Heartfelt sentiments of the alumni surfaced in the following poem:

> No more shall the war cry sever,
> Or the winding rivers be red:
> They banish our anger forever,
> When they laurel the graves of our dead!
> Under the sod and the dew,
> Waiting the judgment day:
> Love and tears for the blue;
> Tears and love for the gray.[39]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For those who doubt the benefits of an Ivy League education no better proof could be given than the tin ear and palsied hand of the men of Yale. A urine-soaked sot confined to a Galway shebeen would have written better verse with some editing substituting blue and an occasional gray where he would write green. Poor Alling under the sod and dew was not recalled with love and tears nor tears and love. He had been forgotten.

Scholars, lawyers, and professional quibblers may challenge certain numbers and assumptions used in this computation. But one must be aware they are unwilling to accept the conclusion that those who pass themselves off as a nation's conscience, and who certainly are among the affluent, were not willing to endanger themselves to further their beliefs.

Character Development in the Ruling Class

Harvard Book: A Series of Historical Biographical and Historic Sketches, published in 1875 by two grateful members of the class of 1874, provided keen insight into the period.[40] A brief biographical sketch was given of Charles William Eliot, whom many have regarded as the greatest and most influential of all Harvard presidents. They noted his birth in Boston in 1834 and his graduation from Harvard in 1853. After graduation Eliot taught at Harvard and in 1861 was placed in the chemistry department. In 1863 Eliot, after teaching and at age 29, went to Europe for further study. He not only studied chemistry, but acquainted himself with the organization of public instruction. No mention of his lack of service in the greatest trial the American people had ever seen was given though he was 27 years of age when it started and 31 when it ended.

Writing in 1930, a fawning biographer noted Eliot was offered a commission in the cavalry in 1863 after two years of war he had turned down due to family responsibilities and substandard eyesight. He was sure Eliot found the decision "difficult and distasteful." This was after Eliot had written of his shame at seeing Union forces, including men of Massachusetts, run after defeat at the first battle of Bull Run. Afterwards Eliot in high heat wrote of the need for a great republic to fight for ten years if necessary, to dig up the root of evil in defense and honor.[41] (Ambrose Bierce, who fought bravely in the Civil War and came to respect mightily his Confederate adversaries, noted that Hell hath no fury like a noncombatant.) This biographer assured the reader that Eliot when in Europe and when war was raging, had written home for advice for what he could do for the Union cause if he went home. He wasted hours waiting around Monroe's Bank in Paris waiting for bulletins at anxious moments. If he were to be drafted, Eliot informed his mother he would return to America immediately and not exercise his privilege in hiring a substitute.[42]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This pious man shortly thereafter became President of Harvard in 1869. In 1996, a Professor of English at Amherst published *Manhood at Harvard*: *William James and Others*, which traced the development of manliness at Harvard under Eliot. With absolute absence of irony the author cited Eliot's inaugural speech where he informed the assembled that the aristocracy "in war rides first into the murderous thickets."[43] Eliot would serve 40 years as president and role model for aspiring gentlemen. His character and fortitude would be copied by two generations of the American moneyed classes.

Even in 1924, during his ninetieth birthday celebration at Harvard, Eliot informed his audience in his youth he was noted for having zest for combat. In refreshed memory he cited his inaugural speech some 55 years previous. His manliness was nurtured on the playground. He wanted the gates to the playground to memorialize sons of Harvard who died for their country. Not to exclude those deprived of opportunity to demonstrate their manliness, he emphasized the duty of all Harvard men to serve their country in peace as well as war.[44] He affirmed he had seen the same spirit in men of Harvard when war broke out against Germany in 1917 as when the Civil War came about.[45]

Harvard did not forget those who fought valiantly by erecting a Memorial Hall for the fallen. On Commemoration Day July 21, 1865, the departed were solemnly remembered with the inclusion of this heartfelt poem of the day:

> In every nobler mood
> We feel the orient of their spirit glow,
> Part of our life's unalterable good,
> Of all our saintlier aspiration;
> They come transfigured back,
> Secure from change in their high-hearted ways,
> Beautiful evermore, and with the rays
> Of morn on their white shields of Expectation.

One of the few great benefits the dead of Harvard ever received was not having to listen to this poem, though survivors who fought and lived did listen and suffered once more. However, Morison was so impressed with it he cited it in his history of Harvard's illustrious 300 years.

The great exception among all the Harvard graduates has been Oliver Wendell Holmes, the great jurist, who if for nothing else is remembered so fondly because they must produce one name to prove the university was not totally bereft of war heroes. Holmes left Harvard in 1861 at the age of 20 and for three years was in the thick of the battles of the Civil War. Holmes was thrice wounded, once very seriously, and when on the Supreme Court, would take his clerks to Arlington Cemetery to show them the graves and was heard to remark that World War I was not nearly as severe as "our war."

In October 1911, Holmes[46] wrote a letter to Alice Stopford Green thanking her for a letter that warmed his heart, and he magnanimously blessed her flattering Irish tongue. Then he halfheartedly lamented the death of Harlan,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the senior Justice, as one who had some of the faults of the savage and had outlived his usefulness. Then Holmes informed Miss Alice of the coming anniversary of his first battle and wound at Ball's Bluff, some 50 years previously. Then Justice Holmes pontificated on death, a topic not generally well received by Americans. Almost 20 years later when close to 90 Justice Holmes mentioned the anniversary of the battles of Antietam, Ball's Bluff and Fredericksburg to his secretary, Alger Hiss.[47] Mr. Hiss, unlike Miss Alice, did not bring any understanding or empathy to the old man. There was no mention of visiting cemeteries. The Justice had wasted his time.

Holmes, if remembered today, is known for his comments about limiting free speech so that "fire" cannot be shouted in a crowded theater and his oratory on Memorial Days. The former has brought knowing nods from lawyers and others who are concerned with having limits on human freedoms. The latter has brought derisive contempt from the critics of present day America. The one speech especially condemned has been the address on Memorial Day of 1895 at a meeting called by the graduating class of Harvard and entitled "The Soldier's Faith."[48]

This speech introduced the phrase "rootless cosmopolitanism" into the American language and wondered if the growing hatred by the poor for the rich was not predicated on the belief that money was the main thing. The rich had foisted this belief on the poor. Holmes talked of his childhood when he met some soldiers who had fought in the Revolutionary War and how old they were. Only later did Holmes realize that war was the business of young men and noted war when you were at it was horrible and dull. Only with the passage of time was it recognized that "its message was divine." Dangerous sports, such as polo, with an occasional broken neck were the breeding grounds of a race fit for headship and command. The student at Heidelberg University in Germany with a sword slashed face inspired sincere respect in Holmes who felt we did not save our traditions in this country.

Once chronicler of the WASP ruling class, Joseph Alsop, traced the decline of the WASP ascendancy to both the corruptingly vast amounts of money that could be made in the United States after the Civil War and to the often stupid attempts by the moneyed class to ape the European, or at a minimum the English culture.[49] On some reflection the Alsop insight lost some luster as his fellow columnist brother Stewart wrote that not one of their mother's nor their father's ancestors had taken any part whatever in any war. In fact Stewart had confessed that Joseph III had paid a substitute during the Civil War and Joseph I had done exactly the same thing during the Revolutionary War. This absence had been explained by the noted newspaper columnist as not being due to cowardice, but to their hatred of being placed in a subordinate and dependent position. Stewart further explained that nothing was more dependent and subordinate than an army recruit.[50] There was no mention if these illustrious forbearers should have started at the top as a Field Marshal or some similar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position worthy of their stature. This garbage would have a hard time being explained to Englishmen who knew the responsibility of an aristocracy was to act courageously in time of danger to the state and to accept orders from their superiors.

Eminent Civil War historian, Shelby Foote, writing with restrained anguish from a Southern perspective about the effects of war on the North, noted that fifteen institutions of higher learning were founded during that conflict.[51] Among these institutions were Cornell in New York State for aspiring farmers; Vassar for young ladies with cultural pretensions; the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for training scientists (One cannot fail to note the claim by William Butler Yeats that "Science is the opiate of the suburbs." Yeats' disdain of science elicited from the English poet, W.H. Auden the critique that Yeats utterly failed to relate his aesthetic *Weltanschauung* with science.[52] Rather than contest Germany during World War II Mr. Auden escaped the obligations to his home country by running away with his boy friend to the United States where his world view was more appreciated.); and Swarthmore College for young Quakers who needed respite not from the burdens of war, but from hearing others complain about the burdens of war, and who have insured that the college remains an oasis of pious sanctimony and a training ground for the politically noble.

Life on campuses was not interrupted by the noise of battle. The Harvard-Yale boat race stopped in 1861 was resumed three years later amidst the bloodiest year of the war. Not a member of either crew volunteered for service in the navy or in the army. Mr. Foote took care to include President Lincoln in his group of those who sought to help unfortunates escape the allure and danger of battle. After graduating at the age of 22 from Harvard in 1864, young Robert Todd Lincoln was fortunate to have a mother so concerned for his life that she insisted he be hidden away in Harvard Law School. Young Robert professed to be concerned about those who were drafted and died in battle, and he wanted to be in uniform. In January 1865, President Lincoln wrote General Grant about finding a suitable slot for his son. Not surprisingly one opening was found on Grant's staff. Young Robert served from February of 1865 until war's end in early April of that year with no injury. Then and only then did Robert reenter Harvard Law School. No wonder why so many of the old southern diehards detested Lincoln, but there was also no question why so many of the northern rich admired him.[53] In his old age another of Robert Todd Lincoln's characteristics manifested itself. He hated blacks. Adam Clayton Powell, long time congressman from Harlem, remembered him using his cane to crack the knuckles of blacks who opened his car door. Powell, who could pass for white, took great pleasure in fooling the son of the Great Emancipator and pocketing his tip.[54]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Foote also remembered the import chattel trade where immigrants were induced to come to America and fight on the northern side. Northern entrepreneurs of the day formed companies for the express purpose of trafficking in human bodies. The numbers must have been significant as the Richmond *Examiner* declared the Union army to be filled by the "riff-raff of Germany and Ireland." This importation of human flesh did not carry the same stigma as slavery for the high toned Yankee elite, but one is entitled to wonder about the character of those who used these services.

One of the great exculpators of the northern interpretation of the war has been Professor James McPherson, who served as a principal consultant to the highly acclaimed public television series on the Civil War. Professor McPherson claimed that 26% of the white soldiers in the Union army were born overseas while the foreign born constituted 31% of the draft age population. One possible explanation to the under representation of immigrants in military service given by McPherson was the exemption from conscription given to aliens who had not filed for citizenship. Then McPherson said that two of the principal ethnic groups - German and British Protestants - enlisted in proportion to their representation in the general population, but that German and Irish Catholics did not. McPherson asserted he had data for these pronouncements, but did not bother to cite it. Nor has McPherson responded to letters requesting his sources.

(When a black professor was assigned by the magazine *Black Scholar* to critique *The Bell Curve*, which maintained subnormal performance by blacks on intelligence tests, Professor McPherson advised the black professor against reading the book. Reportedly Professor McPherson of Princeton told the black that reading the book was exactly what "those white boys" wanted him to do. If he did so, the black would have to contend with their ideas that would distract the black from contradicting a lot of nonsense.[55] How McPherson could know the book was nonsense without reading it has defied logic. But the most pertinent point was the classic illustration of the closed mind of the establishment academician, McPherson, when confronted with challenges to his deeply held beliefs.)

Jews in the Civil War

One of the curious things about the McPhersons of this country has been what they omit and fail to cite either from plain ignorance or deliberate oversight. The puritan strain in America is represented in McPherson, who with a sinecure at Princeton and once a leadership position in the Presbyterian church, carefully made judgments which affirmed the social and cultural superiority of his class. That Roman Catholics were fair game has long been accepted, and that Jews were not has been a covenant of a more recent age. However, the *Encyclopedia Judaica*, published in Jerusalem, gave a Jewish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population of the United States in 1860 of about 150,000. A little further in their exposition on the glory of the accomplishments of Jews in the United States gave a total of 500 Jews who fell during the Civil War. These numbers were proudly recounted by *The Jewish Veteran*, the official newsletter of the Jewish War Veterans.[56] A little computation arrived at the ratio of one Jew in every 300 dying during that war. This worked out to little more than three deaths per thousand Jews. This contribution to the Civil War death toll was of the order of one sixth or one seventh of the rest of the population after making allowances that restrictions were placed on service by blacks. One could feel supremely confident that Jews came nowhere close to matching the contribution of the immigrant Irish on a proportional basis.

The question must be why this fact has not been widely known and discussed. The supposition that the esteemed Presbyterian elder James McPherson was unaware of it is simply ludicrous, but far more interesting has been why he would not comment on it. Until the 1930s in the United States the progressive element was almost exclusively in the hands of radical non-conformists and high-minded Christians who attested to the probity of all those who wished to be admitted to their circle. These people asserted their cultural and moral superiority by professing pacifism as the answer to everything and at all times.

In 1941, just prior to World War II, Father Danial Ryan had written of the contribution of American Catholics to the American war dead in World War I. Father Ryan, after giving accounting for individual cemeteries in Europe, consolidated his figures as 81,067 American dead in Europe through combat or disease and of that figure some 22,552 were of Roman Catholic faith.[57] Thusly, Roman Catholics in America had accounted for over 28% of the American war dead when they were less than 17% of the American population.[58] This accounting was necessary to counter the blatant claims of the ignorant in the Ku Klux Klan and the much more subtle and much more sinister claims of the ancestors of Professor McPherson that Catholics were not real Americans. True to form Roman Catholics have forgotten this or have through exposure to modern American mores become ashamed of having scrutinized the dead in the first place. The Irish hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church has lacked cultural surety and moral courage when confronting those they regard as their superiors. Their bishops tug the forelock and content themselves with their sheep.

Given the magnitude of the Nazi onslaught in Europe, American Jews were able to claim much of this position of innocence and righteousness by virtue of their being the most prominent victims of the Nazis. By some ill-defined and little understood process this has entitled Jews to determine what and who are worth defending. One might suspect an uneasy truce existing between the old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order represented by McPherson and the newer order represented by Jews so prevalent in the media where the most basic claims by both sides to innocence and standing are not challenged.

Blacks in the Civil War

A maliciously distorted view of participation by blacks in America's wars has long existed. Why this interpretation has existed for such a long time can be explained only by moral cowardice of whites and dishonesty by both blacks and whites. As with so many issues involving race in the United States no public discussion has been possible unless euphemisms are used, and both sides accept forbidden topics.

When the issue becomes the Civil War, obvious stupid mistakes, if not outright misrepresentations about black participation in this war, have become almost criminally irresponsible. *Ebony Handbook*, published in 1973, gives the below information for black participation:[59]

	Total	*Black*	*Black Percentage*
Union Army	2,213,363	278,312	12
Battle Deaths	140,414	36,847	14

The historian from Princeton, Professor James McPherson, gave his and other generally accepted estimates of the Union dead, which would include both battlefield and non-combat related deaths at about 360,000.[60] His estimate of blacks serving in Union forces was about 179,000 black soldiers and perhaps as many as 20,000 black sailors.[61] What caused the greater dispute was the accounting of the dead. The number of war deaths for Union troops as given by *Ebony* approximated the accepted number, but the number of deaths under battlefield conditions for the blacks was totally out of line. How *Ebony* computed some 36,000 black deaths allegedly occurring on the battlefield out of 140,000 total battlefield deaths to be 14% of the total has illustrated the sloppy, irresponsible statistics tolerated when originated by blacks.

Most estimates for battlefield deaths for blacks hovered at about 3000, which would make the estimated total less than ten percent of Ebony's inflated guess. Professor McPherson wrote of six percent of white Union troops being killed in action while only 1.5 percent of black Union troops were killed under combat conditions. Fully 19% of black troops died from disease, which was a rate of almost twice that of white soldiers. Much of this large discrepancy has to be attributed to poor sanitation practices among blacks who did not receive the medical care that whites did. The historian of black issues, Herbert

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aptheker, gave as his estimate of the black civil war dead as 2870 killed or mortally wounded while 29,756 died of disease.[62] Mr. Aptheker, who had been a lifelong communist, dedicated one of his works to his charming daughter, Bettina, who was arrested for attempting to blow people up with bombs, and to Angela Davis, who still runs as a Communist candidate.[63] In addition Mr. Aptheker was optimistic enough to dedicate the volume to the future that their solidarity symbolized. Even in February 1991, *Ebony* asserted that Union records show 37,638 black casualties, which they maintained was 21% of Union casualties.[64]

Has nobody challenged the blatant distortions, if not lies by the black cultural elite? The effort by the white war dead has been denigrated, and the black contribution has been inflated. This blatant distortion of the truth has persisted for at least fifty years, and an inspired, yet educated, guess would be the misrepresentation has been believed in the black culture for over one hundred years.

Blacks had a population of almost 900,000 men in the 15 to 40 years of age in 1860. Their combat dead of 3000 in that selected group gave a death rate of little over 3.3 per 1000. Northern whites had somewhere around 110,000 die under combat conditions. With their pool of almost 4,350,000 to draw on, northern whites died at a rate of slightly more than 25 per 1000. Proportionately whites died at almost 8 times the rate blacks died on the battlefield. This upsetting fact is never discussed when the issue of reparations for blacks comes up.

Professor McPherson of Princeton has represented the lineal descent of the abolitionist strain in America of the late twentieth century. The need to belittle much of the white race and conversely to inflate the black race has been evident in his writings. Quoting a Negro author on the riots in New York City on July 13, 1863 that the mob was composed mostly of the lowest and most degraded of the foreign population (mostly Irish), dragged from the filthiest cellars and dens of the city, Mr. McPherson made clear where his sympathies lay. Another Negro correspondent remarked on the Irish becoming so brutish that it was unsafe for families to live near them. In the village of Flushing the Roman Catholic priest was visited by a delegation of blacks who told him they were peaceable men, but if black houses were burned, two Irish houses would burn for every one of theirs. For every colored man killed two Irish would die. These blacks were not mobbed. Where blacks were armed for self-defense, they were not bothered.

A black physician, Dr. J.W.C. Pennington, noted the opposition to the draft came from that class of men of foreign birth who declared their intention to become citizens, but had not done so. They had been notified they should leave the country within sixty days or submit to the draft. They did not wish to leave the country, and they did not wish to fight. In a trenchant observation in 1864 Dr. Pennington remarked, “Dishonest politicians aim to make these men

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believe that the war has been undertaken to abolish slavery; and so far as they believe so, their feelings are against colored people."[65] If Dr. Pennington were to come to life in the America of the first decade of the twenty-first century, he would soon discover that dishonest politicians and academics have long maintained the Civil War was fought over slavery.

AMERICANS IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Popular American imagination has had the United States winning both wars of the 20th century against the Germans. In reality we were of distinct secondary importance, suffered little and benefited greatly, as Chou En Lai told James Reston. [66]

As William Faulkner noted, the past has not gone, but remains. American culture has been shaped by the three groups that escaped the travails and burdens of the Civil War. During the war in Vietnam the campuses at Harvard and Yale once again provided sanctuary for the affluent. ROTC had been banned from their refuge to provide one more reason why they need not serve.

Even in World War II, using the 1940 census figures of almost 5 million Jews[67] in an American population of 131 million that included 13 million blacks, Jews cowered and fled. American combat deaths totaled 292,000 with only 700 of them being black, as blacks were not allowed to fight commensurate with their numbers. Jews had 8000 combat deaths[68] while their fellow Americans, not black or Jewish, had over 280,000. Jews died at a rate of 1.6 per 1000 Jews while white gentiles died at a rate of more than 2.4 per 1000. During that war Jews had 2500 non-combat deaths and died at an overall rate of 2.1 per 1000. White gentiles died at a rate more than 3.4 per 1000.

In Germany of World War I Jews numbered about 600,000 and had 12,000 deaths. The 57 million Germans had over 1,800,000 deaths. Jews died for the Kaiser at the rate of 20 per 1000 while other Germans died at a rate more than 50% higher, more than 31 per 1000.

To point out the obvious, the Jews of Germany died for the Kaiser at almost 10 times the rate their American kin would do fighting the Germany of Adolf Hitler, by reputation the most evil country ever to exist. If Jews of America would not fight in World War II, the question must be asked: When would they fight? The answer must be never. So much for the claptrap that men will dutifully fight and die if the cause is sufficiently noble.

For the Vietnam War the estimated population of the United States in 1967 was slightly over 200 million with Jews being 5.87 million of that total, or almost 3% of the general population. Given the total of American dead for the war was slightly above 58,000, the "fair" share contribution would be about 1700 of those dead coming from Jews. One privately published analysis of Vietnam War dead used data in the Southeast Asia Combat Area Casualties File in the National Archives and concluded after a computer count that 269 Jews died in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that conflict.[69] Later this information was discreetly published on the internet and not publicized.[70] Other Americans died at a rate more than six times as much as Jews.

In 1990 prior to the Gulf War, Abe Rosenthal, once editor of the *New York Times*, blasted Republican presidential aspirant, Pat Buchanan for stating the war would be fought by people named McAllister, Murphy, Gonzales and Leroy Brown. Mr. Rosenthal, acting as censor, believed this statement offensive to Jews. Even in 1996 Mr. Rosenthal demanded that Buchanan retract his assertion.[71] Unwelcomed truth has never interested Mr. Rosenthal and friends. At least one letter detailing their deceit was not published. For the war in Vietnam, 11 men named McAllister died; 81 men named Murphy; 84 men named Gonzales; and 380 men named Brown.[72] Twice as many men named by Buchanan died than Jews. To the *New York Times* these men and their families are much more remote and much less important than a Brooklyn born settler on the West Bank of the Jordan River.

For the war against Iraq, the Jewish Welfare Board estimated out of about 520,000 American troops in the Gulf only 500 were Jews.[73] If Jews had been there in proportion to their numbers, almost 13,000, some 25 times the number present, would have been in uniform. Mr. Maury Maverick found that not one of the 386 Americans who died was a Jew.[74] Later in the pages of the *New York Times* there was an attempt to revise the total of Jews present in the war zone upward as had been done in previous wars to bolster the image of Jews.[75]

Blacks in Vietnam

If the U.S. is to regain voices of intellectual honesty and courage, much of it will have to come from an emerging class of black intellectuals and professionals. An ideal place for black intellectuals to start would be to challenge the lies so believed by the black lower class and the white liberal media who have felt it their duty to tell many of these lies. One such lie has been the belief among blacks that blacks died in the Vietnam War in numbers greater than their share of the population. This vicious calumny so disturbed Richard Nixon he had tried to confront and refute this lie, but to no avail.[76]

In 1968, the year in which the U.S. took the most casualties in Vietnam, there were 14,686 murders in America. For whites some 6,806 died with 5,106 being male. For blacks 7,880 died with black males being 6,417 of the victims.[77] Blacks, despite being outnumbered by whites almost eight to one, managed to murder and die more than whites. In Vietnam for that fateful year about 15,000 men died with about 12% being black. For blacks this would give about 1800 dead in Vietnam, less than one-fourth the number of blacks murdered in America. Black crime was much the greater killer of blacks than the war in Vietnam. For whites the war in Vietnam took almost twice as many lives than murder did. The American media has never bothered to make clear the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

misconception by blacks that they suffered out of proportion in that war and that they were deliberately targeted by a white power structure to die. This malicious lie has been fostered by a white liberal power structure in the media that ducked that war and has felt their support for what they consider necessary lies, on the part of blacks is justified by past injustices. The effect of that lie on the white lower class has never entered their consciousness.

A great intrusion into the liberal mindset of the United States took place when Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in June 1978, delivered the commencement address at Harvard. After reminding the assembled that the motto of Harvard was "Veritas", the great Russian told them that "truth is seldom sweet; it is almost invariably bitter." Then he cautioned them that he came as a friend to deliver bitter truths. For a crowd that long recited the cant that truth was beauty and beauty was truth this was a brutal assault on their cherished beliefs.

After reminding the Harvard audience and many others that in the 20th century Western democracy had not won any great war by itself, Solzhenitsyn cautioned against the West aligning itself with China. In two World Wars the West had taken care to shield itself with the armies of Russia when they should have been capable of winning the wars by themselves. Those advocating an alliance with China and using it as a shield should remember that at a later date China armed with American weapons could turn on America, which could fall victim to a Cambodian-style genocide. Yet these warnings and no weapons would help the West unless they recovered their willpower and confidence. To defend oneself, one must be ready to die, and there was very little such readiness in a society raised on a cult of material well-being. In closing he chose to instruct the faithless that humanism, which had lost its Christian heritage, could not expect to prevail.[78]

His poignant remarks have largely been forgotten because he excluded Israel from the West. Their theocratic government disqualified them. Significantly Israeli Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, placed his country in Asia, but thought Americans must know that the only two democracies in Asia were Israel and Japan. Ben-Gurion placated many critics who long felt Israelis had little in common with the West. [79]

Yet Solzhenitsyn's words bear more importance today than then. Many believe the fall of the Soviet Union was caused by the rise of China in the decade before the fall. The role of the U.S. and Ronald Reagan has been exaggerated. Despite what we choose to believe, China has assumed the role of the nascent expanding power while the United States has become the declining aging power. The seat of world power seems to be shifting once again to Asia where it has resided for much of human history. Globalization with its economic rigidity has moved the wealth-generating industries to China while denuding the United States. The deliberate lowering of academic standards has hastened

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the acceptance of most Americans to their lot in life. The economic elite cares little in terms of which political party rules, but order in America and accretion of wealth matters mightily.

Under Bill Clinton the American rush to leadership in the Third World accelerated, and under George W. Bush there appears to be little shift in plans from this embarrassing foolhardiness. After World War I, Oswald Spengler observed that once a nation thinks exclusively in economic terms it loses its ability to think politically. He said it was true of Carthage in Roman times and even more so of Woodrow Wilson's America.[80] The America of today surpasses Wilson's America in tunnel vision. The only foreign endeavor considered important by the entertainment Mafia and media elite revolves around stabilizing conflict in the Middle East. Russia, Germany, China and Japan have been relegated to secondary considerations.

A truly wise American, George Kennan, nearing 100 years of age, has stated he did not regard the United States civilization of the post-World War II era as a successful civilization. Mr. Kennan did not think the political system of present day America adequate to the age to which we are moving. Mr. Kennan described why this country is destined to succumb to failures that cannot be other than tragic and enormous.[81] Mr. Kennan has not been alone in his pessimism. Those who agree cannot speak or write in the mainstream media. We are to suffer our fate in silence and to live and to die like the flies of summer.

POSTSCRIPT

On April 7, 2002 the *Japan Times* carried the comments by Liberal Party leader Ichiro Ozawa that Japan could easily become a nuclear power. He stated Japan had enough plutonium to make 3 to 4 thousand nuclear weapons. "If that should happen, we wouldn't lose (to China) in terms of military strength. What would (China) do then?" Not one word has appeared in the American press that has ceased to cover the American military in Afghanistan and concentrated its resources on Israel. One must ask what the Chinese think. Not one word has appeared in the American press. If a German party leader had made a similar remark to the Russians, the *New York Times* would push Israel off the front page.

[http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20020407a1.htm]

In the May 5, 2002 issue of the *Japan Times*, Donald Richie reviewed *Tokyo Central* by Edward Seidensticker. Richie recognized Seidensticker as a very moral man who made stern judgments. One was "that the emperor was neither forced to abdicate nor taken to court as a war criminal was owing General MacArthur's vanity. He loved having an emperor under him…" Both Richie and Seidensticker are pre-eminent authorities on Japanese culture, history and politics. Both recognize that Hirohito was a great war criminal by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any definition. His Japan killed more people and occupied more territory than Hitler's Germany. Yet he was never held to standards of justice that were applied to the Germans. The Chinese will never forget this.

[http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?fb20020505dr.htm]

Richard Earley is the author of **War, Money and American Memory: Myths of Virtue, Valor and Patriotism**, Diane Publishing. Additional information about this book is available from http://www.amazon. com or the publisher http://www.dianepublishingcentral.com/Product....3064391 (Diane Publishing, Box 1428, Collingdale, Pa 19023, TEL 1-800-782-3833).

End Notes

1. J.N. Westwood, *Russia Against Japan 1904-05: A New Look at the Russo-Japanese War*, State University of New York, 1988, p. 35.

2. *NYT*, Feb 13, 1904, p. 8 (editorial page).

3. *Congressional Record*, p3334, April 11, 1947, (inserted by Senator Thomas of Utah and extracted from Zabriskie's *American-Russian Rivalry in the Far East, 1895-1914*).

4. *NYT*, May 7, 1995, pE3.

5. *NYT*, May 21, 1995, p4.

6. Michael Blankfort, *The Big Yankee: The Life of Carlson of the Raiders*, Little, Brown 1947, pp. 237-41.

7. *Pearl Harbor Attack: Hearings Joint Committee, 79th Congress* part 11, April 9, 1946, pp. 5432-3, USGPO, 1946.

8. Carroll V. Glines, *The Doolittle Raid*, Orion Books, 1988, pp. 150-1.

9. Eric Wolf, *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*, Harper & Row, 1969, p. 120.

10. *New York Times: Report From Red China*, Quadrangle Books, 1971, pp. 92-4, & 346.

11. T.S. Eliot, *Christianity and Culture*, Harcourt, Brace, 1968, p. 118.

12. *American Heritage* Magazine, November 1989, p. 8.

13. August Myer, *A History of the Great American Fortunes*, 1908, Random House [Modern Library edition], 1957.

14. Ron Chernow, *The House of Morgan*, Atlantic Monthly Press, 1990, p. 22.

15. __, *Columbia University: A History 1754-1904*, MacMillan, 1904, p. 138.

16. Pound, *Ezra Pound - Selected Prose 1909-65*, New Directions, 1972, p.171.

17. David E. Koskoff, *The Mellons - The Chronicle of America's Richest Family*, Thomas T. Crowell, 1978, pp. 25-9.

18. Isabel Ross, *An American Family - The Tafts: 1678-1964*, World Publishing Co, 1964, pp.12, 38, 40.

19. *The New England Magazine*, March 1891, pp. 3-23.

20. *New England Magazine*, February 1890, pp. 675-81.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

21. James McPherson, *Drawn by the Sword*, Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 99.

22. E.B. Long, *The Civil War Day by Day: An Almanac 1861-1865*, Doubleday, 1971, pp. 704-11.

23. Walter Millis, *Arms and Men: A Study of American Military History*, Putnam, 1956, pp. 103-5.

24. - *Roll of Students of Harvard College Who Have Served in the Army or Navy During the War of Rebellion*, Commemoration Day July 21, 1865, John Wilson & Son, 116 Water Street, Boston, 1865.

-Thomas Wentworth Higginson, *Harvard Memorial Biographies*, vol. 1 & 2, table of contents and appendix to vol. 2, Sever & Francis, 1866.

- Francis H. Brown, *Harvard University in the War of 1861-1865*, Cupples, Upham & Co, 1886.

25. McPherson, opcit, p. 113.

26. *New England Magazine*, March 1891, pp. 6-7.

27. Samuel Eliot Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard: 1636-1936*, Harvard Press, 1937, pp. 302-4.

28. Ellsworth Eliot, *Yale in the Civil War*, Yale Univ Press, 1932, pp. 72-82.

29. Eliot, ibid, p. 24 (Table II).

30. Eliot, ibid, p. 8 (Table I).

31. Eliot, ibid, pp. 5-16.

32. Eliot, ibid, p. 23.

33. Eliot, ibid, p. 29.

34. *Valedictory: Poem and Oration*, Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 1865, p. 22, Senior Class in Yale College on Presentation Day June 21, 1865.

35. ibid, p. 20.

36. ibid, p. 39.

37. Ellsworth Eliot, opcit, p. 23 & p. 71.

38. James McPherson, *Drawn by the Sword*, Oxford Univ Press, 1996, p. 92.

39. Ellsworth Elliot, opcit, p. 62.

40. Vaille and Clark, *Harvard Book*, Cambridge, Welch, Bigelow, Univ Press, 1875, pp. 61-70, 52, (bio of Eliot).

41. Henry James, *Charles William Eliot*, Vol. 1, Houghton, Mifflin, 1930, pp. 88-93.

42. James, ibid, p. 139.

43. Kim Townsend, *Manhood at Harvard: William James and Others*, W. W. Norton, 1996, p. 96.

44. *The Ninetieth Birthday Celebration of Charles William Eliot: Proceeding*, Harvard Press, 1925, pp. 24-7.

45. ibid, p. 29.

46. Richard E. Posner, *The Essential Holmes*, Univ of Chicago Press, 1992, p. 3.

47. Alger Hiss, *Recollections of a Life*, Seaver, 1988, p. 33.

48. Julius J. Marke, *The Holmes Reader*, Oceana, 1964, pp. 101, in speech "The Soldiers' Faith" delivered on Memorial Day 1895 to Graduating Class at Harvard.

49. Joseph Alsop, *I've Seen the Best of It*, Norton, 1992, p. 33.

50. Stewart Alsop, *Stay of Execution: A Sort of Memoir*, Lippincott, 1973, p. 55.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

51. Shelby Foote, *The Civil War: A Narrative*, Random House, 1963, p. 151.
52. *Nation*, Oct 12, 1940, p. 333.
53. *NYT*, Aug 22, 1988, p. B6. (Foote's *Red River to Appomattox*, the third volume in his civil war trilogy is quoted in approving manner.)
54. Charles V. Hamilton, *Adam Clayton Powell Jr*, Athenum, 1991, p. 50.
55. *The Black Scholar*, Vol 25, No. 1, p. 32, (undated, but published in 1995) article by Gerald Early.
56. *The Jewish Veteran*, Winter 1992, p. 16.
57. Danial J. Ryan, *American Catholic World War I Records*, Catholic Univ. Press, 1941, pp. 88-9.
58. Ryan, ibid, p. 13.
59. *Ebony Handbook*, ibid, p. 200.
60. James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War & Reconstruction*, Knopf, 1982, p. 488.
61. McPherson, ibid, p. 355.
62. *The Journal of Negro History*, United Publishing, 1969, pp. 12-3, (article by Herbert Aptheker).
63. *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States (1910-1932): From Emergence of the NAACP to the Beginning of the New Deal*, Dedication Page, Citadel Press, 1973, (ed. Herbert Aptheker).
64. *Ebony* Magazine, p. 103, Feb 1991.
65. James McPherson, *The Negro's Civil War*, Pantheon, 1965, pp. 70-5.
66. *New York Times: Report From Red China*, Quadrangle Books, 1971, pp. 92-4 & 346.
67. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 15, p. 892.
68. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 15, Kefer Press, 1972, p.1634.
69. William F. Abbott, *The Names on the Wall: A Closer Look - A Sociological Analysis and Commentary*, June 1991 (Privately published by Mr. Abbott of 121 Imperial Avenue, Westport, Connecticut, 06880).
70. AOL. Warlibrary.
71. *NYT*, Feb 9, 1996 p. A29.
72. *Vietnam Veteran's Memorial Directory*, 1984.
73. *NYT*, Mar 18, 1991, p. B6.
74. *Washington Monthly*, December 1991, p. 10. (Also author communication with Maury Maverick.)
75. *NYT*, May 18, 1991, p. 9.
76. Richard Nixon, *No More Vietnams*, Arbor House, 1985, p.128.
77. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1976*, (US Bureau of Census, 1976).
78. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Sep 1, 1978, pp. 678-84, delivered June 8, 1978 at Harvard's Commencement.
79. C.L. Sulzburger, *An Age of Mediocrity: Memoirs and Diaries: 1963-1973*, MacMillan, 1973, pp. 448-53.
80. Oswald Spengler, Decline of the West, Vol II, Knopf, 1939, p. 475.
81. William Pfaff, *Barbarian Sentiments*, Hill & Wang, 1989, p. 182.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McCulloch, Nordishism & Enlightened White Separatism

Tristan Torriani

Richard McCulloch's advocacy of North European racial preservation deserves close examination from all Europeans, because if his views become dominant in the coming decades, they will have profound consequences for the future of Western bio-cultural societies. My view is that while it is important to preserve North European populations in a separate homeland, the survival and continuity of Iberian, Italic and Balkan (henceforth IIB for short) groups should not be neglected, as they are equally legitimate members of the European family of nations. Europeans may vary in phenotype from a Richard A. Gephardt to a Mario Cuomo, from a Danny de Vito to a Dolph Lundgren and a Brigitte Nielsen. Given this wide range, it may be tempting for some to simplify things by excluding what appear to be less exalted groups. However, while no group should be forced to co-exist with another it dislikes (one is reminded of the Balkan situation), an enlightened white separatism will respect the ethnic rights of all groups that over the centuries have grown roots on European soil as their homeland.

There are two major difficulties in commenting on McCulloch's work that should be mentioned beforehand to prevent an unfair critique. First of all, one should acknowledge the massive multilevel campaign waged against North European (and in a general sense, but less intense, European and Christian) identity after the WWII by either Jewish influence or ownership of mass media outlets. The practical effect of this has been to instill a deep sense of guilt and shame in us all, while the genocide perpetrated against Slavs in the name of Marxism and Bolshevism goes unmentioned. In this context, any attempt by a Northern European to reclaim his or her identity and dignity by setting the situation straight can only be commended. Nothing can justify the irreversible destruction of any European existence, certainly not a highly dubious notion of "collective guilt." On the contrary, it is imperative that European cultures be preserved and allowed to reach their highest degree of development, thus realizing their ultimate destiny. However, one should not ignore the massive defamation of Italian-Americans by the very same media, ranging from "funny" sit-coms about organized crime to suggestions that Italians are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Negroes. Both North and South Europeans have had their share of discrimination and it would be only reasonable that we make a common cause in combating this together.

One should add, moreover, that as the multiracial-state model begins to show its unstable and destructive nature, our political culture may change radically in the next years. Some kind of racialism, if not racism, is bound to become fashionable as ethnic conflict intensifies and its lines become more visible. This is why it is so important to assure a place for scientifically-grounded and politically-enlightened racialism. Politically correct hysteria and race-denial, coupled with more race-mixing propaganda, will clearly not do, and any clamping down on free-speech will only blind us to the real issues and increase the force of the explosion when the current multiracial system falls apart.

Another difficulty in discussing McCulloch's project is that I, being a Spanish-North-Italian hybrid, do not belong to the constituency he is concerned with. This makes me an outsider and hence I may not have the same racial perceptions consistent with his Nordish self-identification. For practical purposes, that means that while I do appreciate differences in eye, hair color, and skull shape that distinguish me from a Scandinavian, I still consider myself as much a full-blooded European and heir to Western civilization as any other. The future of Europeanhood depends as much on the preservation of our genetic characteristics as it does on the study and continuation of our ethnic traditions. The avoidance of in-group conflicts by bonding will also require, at the very least, reciprocal respect and a pact of mutual non-aggression among groups of European descent. For all its bureaucracy and its threat to local autonomy, the EU has learned the lesson to be drawn from two World Wars. Similarly to McCulloch on Nordish preservation, however, it is not so much "what" but "how" a European Union should develop that needs to be discussed. And this becomes harder by introducing a questionable racial division that excludes European IIB nations such as Greece, Italy and Spain from the debate. A couple of quotes from McCulloch himself deserve some space here.

> As one would expect from this protected insularity, all of the indigenous races of Europe belong to the same subspecies -- the Caucasian. (Non-Caucasians did not begin entering Europe in significant numbers until 1957). But they do not all belong to the same race, as they are not all able to interbreed without negating or diminishing the racial traits of one or both parent stocks. In fact, the European population consists of several different regional racial groups or geographic races whose traits are not genetically compatible but are negated or diminished by interbreeding between the groups. (http://www.racialcompact.com/nordishrace.html)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

According to McCulloch's racial perception, Europeans do not form a single race because of what he calls "negating or diminishing the racial traits of one or both parent stocks." The problem here is that, as Mike Rienzi points out, McCulloch understands racial traits mostly in phenotypic terms, while it is the ethnos that should be the unit of racial preservation, encompassing the whole bio-culture, with its distinctive historical and genetic inheritance. A narrow understanding of Nordish identity has a radically reductionist effect upon our views of what civilization is all about because it leaves out IQ, moral traits such as loyalty and in-group solidarity, and extended phenotypic features such as cultural and technical artifacts. By singling out phenotype as *the* principal criterion of in-group membership, it is theoretically possible that white-looking mulattos (or Jews, for that matter) be considered Nordish, allowing for an unperceived influx of Sub-Saharan genes into the Nordish gene pool. This makes it an insufficient criterion for deciding in-group membership. Besides, the civilizational accomplishments of Non-Nordish men from Greek antiquity to the Italian Renaissance would either become something distant and foreign or would have to be appropriated in a dubious Gobinist fashion.

The fact of the matter is that Europe, throughout its history, has most of the time been beset by external aggression and infiltration, torn asunder by internal conflicts among its peoples and has enlightened humanity also at a great cost to itself. If we are to claim what is our rightful heritage, we must do it in full. It makes no sense whatsoever to lop off our civilization's roots and dismiss them for being Mediterranean. McCulloch's single-minded focus on the Nordish phenotype is not balanced by any other consideration as far as I can see, and this is why it is dangerous. It is neither a sufficient criterion for European status, for a mulatto or Jew may look Nordish, nor is it necessary, for not all Europeans must look Nordish. Nietzsche would have probably remarked that the best that can be achieved by a policy based on McCulloch's principles is a Nordish-looking herd, in which the only thing that matters is phenotype. Perhaps this longing to live in such a herd may be McCulloch's deepest motivation, and this is a personal choice of his to which he is wholly entitled. But if the result here is to tear up the fragile unity of Europe because of a purely phenotypic criterion invented to satisfy McCulloch's racial preferences, disregarding all else, it is unacceptable.

A recurrent expression McCulloch uses is that Nordish are the "most threatened" by miscegenation. Again, the problem here is that this depends very much on what alleles are involved. Basques have a high percentage of individuals with *Rh*- blood type, the inheritance of which is "recessive" (actually, it may involve multiple alleles, but for the sake of the argument, we can leave it at that). The influx of Mongolid genes (which have a 0.0 frequency for the allele *rh*) or even Scandinavian genes with low *rh* frequencies would increase the pregnancy cases of erythroblastosis fetalis in the Basque population. This would threaten the Basque survival much more than an influx

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of brown haired and hazel eyed central Europeans into Scandinavia. The relative threat to Europeans in general may vary according to what genes are involved, but good sense would suggest that we help each other out instead of playing the victim and claiming to be the "most" threatened.

Another equally serious issue regards the alleged greater purity of Scandinavian populations in comparison to Southern Europeans. Recent Y chromosome studies of male Finns show a substantial Mongolid contribution to their gene pool. The fact of the matter is that while undesirable, this non-European genetic influx has to be assessed in an enlightened way so that reasonable policies can be developed to deal with this inheritance. If a European group has successfully survived such an unwanted genetic influx and has become a viable nation, such as the Finns, it makes no sense whatsoever to exclude it from the European community. To avoid this kind of absurdity, it is critical that we develop multiple criteria of European status, which do justice to the complexity of human nature and the vicissitudes of our history. Reductionist approaches that single out phenotype or specific gene markers to define in-group membership will clearly not do.

Perhaps the greatest problem of all in McCulloch's project is his attempt to provide a foundation for it in the idea of collective rights. The original idea of "right" coming from Hobbes is that there are individuals in the state of nature who make a pact and form a "Leviathan" state that will protect them and allow them to have a more productive and safer life. This is a contract established on individual terms, and is not made between an ethnic community and a state. For this reason, rights are always conceived as pertaining to individuals, not to communities or minorities. If we try to conceive contracts between collectives or ethnic groups, as McCulloch does, one gets to the following result, in his own words:

> Under the Racial Golden Rule non-Northern Europeans would not be permitted to enter the Nordish homelands for the purpose of establishing residency. They could be permitted temporary entry for limited and legitimate purposes, but they would not be permitted to live there. This rule would apply to all non-Nordish immigrants, including refugees and adopted children. As non-Northern Europeans, they do not belong in the Nordish homelands, and their presence there violates the Nordish right to racial separation, independence and continued life. They belong in their own racial homelands, among their own people, who must deal with their own refugees, take care of their own orphans and solve their own problems in accordance with full racial independence and self-determination. For the Nordish race, threatened with racial death by the already too-numerous other races in its midst, each new non-Nordish immigrant into its homelands, and each new non-Nordish child born in its homelands, is just another nail in its coffin. (http://www.racialcompact.com/racialgoldenrule.html)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now it should be obvious that if Nordish collective rights override individual rights of Non-Nordish Europeans, then it would be legal to forcibly evict them from Nordish homelands. While this may not violate the rights of the collectives as a whole, nor may it threaten their existence in their appropriate and respective homelands, it can conceivably put the lives of the individuals involved at risk. What happens then is that the priority given to collective rights destroys individual freedom among Europeans, which is such a distinguishing characteristic of the West. Of course, one would expect that Nordish individuals in their homelands should enjoy more rights as citizens than Non-Nordish foreigners, but again, it is important to at least try to balance individual and collective rights and respect the principle of reciprocity, the idea which rights commits us to. The current situation in Zimbabwe shows us the plight of Whites in what is now in all practical terms a Black homeland. Unless and until White Zimbabweans can be brought back to a European homeland, in so far as the politics of human rights is still operational, it will be necessary to defend their individual (and, if possible, minority) rights there.

Although I accept to discuss ethnic rights and to work within this framework as long as reciprocity is respected, I must confess that I am skeptical of any theory of rights, be it individual or collective, metaphysical or political. It is not just because "might makes right" (to which many replies are possible), but because, once unleashed, the intensity of ethnic hatred is so great that it precludes any rational solution of conflicts, principally in the general population, who really counts in keeping any peace. Conciliatory efforts by racial elites are not lacking today, but such top-down approaches are bound to fail unless there is a widespread desire for peace. Similarly, if talk about rights is going to be taken seriously, this will require a degree of rationality and fairness that humans have historically proven over and over again not to possess. The needs of each racial group are different because of their evolved traits. Therefore, the collective rights each group aspires to are different. In the European case, our reproductive conditions require racial separatism, but African nations depend on foreign aid, without which their collective survival could be threatened. Moreover, claims to rights of one kind or another have become banal in the current political culture and often accomplish nothing but reveal the 'will to power' on the part of the dispossessed. We should not delude ourselves with theories of rights. Sooner or later, talk about rights, being a mere mask for ethnic advocacy as it already is, will lose all its credibility and give way to a politics of raw force.

My conclusion is that even granting the need to assure the survival of Nordish peoples in a separate homeland, racialism must be informed scientifically and be politically enlightened. Balance is needed between genetics and history, between individual and collective rights. The analysis of specific genetic traits must be complemented with holistic understanding of European bio-cultures. While I do not take the above to be a sufficient refutation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of McCulloch's views, I do think it points out issues that must be discussed openly and honestly. If the differences between Europeans are so serious that McCulloch is justified in inventing the Nordish and Non-Nordish categorization, so be it, but then his historical role in the survival of the West will have been that of dividing us instead of helping us to unite in face of our common enemies, who will then conquer us one by one.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Reality Gap:

A Critique of Richard McCulloch's "The Ethnic Gap"

Michael Rienzi

The major focus of this essay is a critique of Richard McCulloch's "The Ethnic Gap", (TEG) which appeared in the first issue of *The Occidental Quarterly*. However, since the ideas in TEG are inextricably linked to McCulloch's general ideas on race, and since readers of TEG were invited to visit McCulloch's "Racial Compact" website for more information on his Nordish views (http://www.racialcompact.com) any complete critique of TEG must also include a brief critique of the Racial Compact site and the ideas presented therein.

There are several serious problems with the Nordish argument (in particular) and McCulloch's views (in general). To start with, there are technical problems. McCulloch focuses on one aspect of phenotypes - physical appearance - as the end all and be all of racialism, ignoring the importance of genes and ancestry. One must consider that it is genes, not phenotypes, which are the ultimate replicators of life. Genes encode phenotypes, not the other way around. Phenotypes may change in the course of a lifetime, but genes remain the same; consider the caterpillar and the butterfly, which it becomes - different phenotypes, but the same genes. If a person has plastic surgery then their phenotype changes, but the genes they possess remain the same, and it is these genes, not the altered phenotype, which are passed down to the next generation.

Neo-Darwinian fitness is defined in terms of genes, not phenotypes; that is, fitness is defined as the success of genes in being replicated, and hence passed down to future generations. Familial and group loyalties focus around a common ancestry (shared genes) rather than shared phenotypes (more on this below), although of course, similar genes and phenotypes are often observed together. To quote van den Berghe: "The genetic propensity is to favor kin, not to favor those who look alike"[1]. The works of Dawkins - *The Selfish Gene*, *The Extended Phenotype*, etc.[2] - explain many of these concepts in greater detail and are highly recommended. There is no doubt whatsoever that the ultimate biological replicator, the ultimate biological concern, is at the level of the genes. In real-life, this manifests itself, as stated above, in a concern for genetically similar organisms[3], related by ancestry (i.e., "kin").

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The combination of genes and ancestry is summed up in the ethnic group or "*ethnie*" (1,3). If you were to stop Euro-Americans in the street, and ask these people to self-identify based on population group, they may say they are "White", "European-American", or more likely, they will identify themselves as "Irish," or "Italian," or "German," or Polish," or "English," etc., or some combination thereof. It is unlikely that any folks - at least those who are not racially conscious - will identify themselves as "Nordics," "Alpinids," "Brunns," "Borrebys," "Dinarics," etc. *Certainly, people do NOT base their political allegiance and voting patterns based on perceived phenotype, as McCulloch seems to imply*. As one example, in TEG (end note 4), McCulloch suggests that the "NCE" (NorthCentral European) category is not limited only to those of "pure" NCE ancestry, but also to those of mixed ancestry (and hence, mixed ethnicity and mixed genes) who have a NCE phenotype. In other words, according to this view, ultimately it is physical appearance, and not ancestry, which determines NCE group membership. [4]

Since the whole point of TEG (probably better named as "The Phenotypic Gap") is to equate NCE group membership with a potential "pro-White" voting pattern, then TEG implicitly suggests that folks vote on the basis of phenotype - an absurd proposition. While folks may well vote on their perception of ethnic / racial interests, I have yet to find a person who looks in the mirror on Election Day and says "Hey, I'm a Nordic, so I'm voting for Bush", or "I'm a Dinaric, so I'm voting for Gore", or "I'm an Upper-Paleolithic Brunn, so I support Ross Perot." People vote based on personal, ideological, and / or ethno-racial interests, not based on their cephalic index or hair color.

The same goes for other important issues dealing with populations. During the first and second World Wars, the German and French ethnies went to war against each other as discrete national entities; the war was NOT one between German and French Nordics on one side, and German and French Alpinids on the other side. And if ethnicity trumps phenotype, as is clear from these examples, we must also note that one can find multiple phenotypes within particular ethnies, and yes, even both "Nordish" and non-"Nordish" phenotypes within single ethnies as well. And this fact applies not only to ethnic groups, but to families - one can find siblings of pure single-ethnic descent that cross boundaries of "races", if races are to be defined by the physical anthropology of Carleton Coon and others.[5] This similarity between ethnie and family is not surprising, since ethnies can be viewed as extended kin (familial) groups.[6] And, just as ethnic loyalty supersedes that of phenotype similarity, so does family loyalty. It should be obvious that ties are closer between two siblings, who may not look much like each other, than between any of these siblings and a more phenotypically similar stranger. People love and care for their own children, rather than for strangers' children to whom they may have a greater physical resemblance. These things are so obvious that it seems almost petty to spend time discussing them, but alas, it is necessary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another flaw in McCulloch's views, as evidenced by his website, is his belief that one can assign numerical values to a subjective evaluation of phenotypes, and that the results of hybridization can be discerned by the arithmetic additions and divisions of these assigned numerical values. Thus, McCulloch seems to think that if a group of people that he assigns the "Nordish" value of "1" interbreed with an equal number of people he assigns the value of "9," then the result will be a population of "5s" (1+9/2 = 5). Needless to say, results of ethnic/racial mixes are determined by the complex interplay of genes, not by mathematical manipulation of numerical rankings. While, for example, Swede-Nigerian hybrids will fall somewhere (not exactly halfway!) between the two original populations, to think that combinations of all types of ethnic mixes can be determined in a numerical manner is a bit of a stretch. And to make distinctions between breeding results differing by numerical fractions of these rankings (e.g., "4.5" vs. "4.8") is ridiculous.

A very large flaw in these views is that the Nordishist crowd seems determined to suggest that their racial classification system is based firmly in traditional physical anthropology, particularly in the work of Carleton Coon, whose findings they seem to admire most of all (e.g., http://www.nordish.com). However, a look at Coon's racial classification system[7] shows that it is incompatible with the Nordishist view. The term Nordish - coined by McCulloch and not by any physical anthropologist - is a collection of Northern European types that the Nordishists say go together, e.g, core "Nordish" groups such as Nordics, Borrebys, and Brunns. However, Coon pointedly states, in a number of places, that these groups *cannot* be lumped together. In Coon's view, Nordics are closest to so-called "Mediterraneans;" in fact Coon considers Nordics to be merely "partially de-pigmented Mediterraneans," and he considers Nordics to be derived from "Mediterranean" racial stock. He considered the "Upper Paleolithic Survivors" (i.e., Borrebys and Brunns) to constitute part of a *separate* subgroup of the Caucasian stock, together with the Alpinids, which Coon considered a reduced (in size, etc.) derivation of the unreduced Upper Paleolithic Group.

Thus, the racial groupings of the Nordishists are not those of Coon, and are in fact completely different. The Nordishists - who like to lump European "Mediterraneans" with Afro-Asiatic groups - also seemingly ignore the fact that Coon identified what he thought were Afro-Asiatic Nordics, Upper Paleolithic survivors, as well as Alpinids. Should Third World colored peoples then be linked to the Nordish and /or NC European groupings? Note that the foregoing is not meant to imply that Coon's view was right and that of the Nordishists wrong, or vice versa; in actuality, I consider both views of racial classification to be flawed. For example, the genetic data - based on thorough analyses of autosomal alleles - makes clear that the various European groups are genetically more similar to each other than to non-European groups, including non-European Caucasian population groups.[8] However, the main

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point is this: any suggestion - either overt or implied - that the Nordishist racial classification system is based upon that of the well-respected Carleton Coon is incorrect, for the reasons already stated. Suggestions to the contrary do the reader of the material a disservice, particularly since, in most cases, the reader will not have access to Coon's original work, and will assume erroneously that the Nordishist/Coon equation holds.

Specific Issues

Several points made in TEG should be directly addressed. First, where do the numbers - verifiable, independent polling data - come from that justify the "estimates" and assumptions made in TEG? It would certainly be useful to see, for example, how Irish-, Italian-, English-, German-, Polish-, and other White ethnic-Americans voted in the 2000 Presidential election, and in that election compared to previous such elections, as well as other important elections as well. Although general racial polling data is available for most elections, intra-racial ethnic data seems scarce to non-existent. Previous attempts in other venues to obtain this information from third parties have been unsuccessful. Without such exact and substantiated figures, everything said on the topic of TEG cannot be absolutely verified, and we have to instead depend on assumptions, logic, or commentaries by political observers (who in some cases may have seen some private polling data). However, given that Mr. McCulloch's estimates of certain groups' voting patterns seem at odds with the opinions of political experts, the need for hard data becomes ever more important. Do "Northern and Eastern European Catholics" really consistently vote Republican more than do Italian-Americans? Are the Boston Irish or Chicago Poles really more conservative than New York Italians? Furthermore, how is it proven that they determine their favorite candidate based upon a self-identification process determined by phenotypic similarity?

I have already discussed the serious flaw of assuming that people vote on the basis of phenotype rather than on ethnicity, and on the implied assumption that subjective perceptions of phenotype, rather than actual ancestry, should determine group membership and voting patterns. Another serious flaw is Mr. McCulloch's lumping of groups. Based on his racial views, as evident from his website, it is not surprising that he lumps certain Euro-American ethnic groups - (Southern) Italians (does McCulloch really believe that his perception of North/South Italian phenotypic differences influences what voting bloc they belong to?), Greeks, and Balkan ethnies - with groups designated as "Middle Eastern."

What do Italian and Greek-Americans - White European Christian peoples of the west - have to do with, for example, Iranians, a non-European, often brown-skinned, Near Eastern people of Muslim faith with a non-western culture and history? Well, to some, these groups "look alike," a very subjective

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion that others may refute upon actually observing members of these groups. These groups have nothing in common historically and culturally, as stated above in their differing descriptions, and their place in both world history and in the ethno-racial mix of America differs markedly. Genetic evidence suggests a clear distinction between these sets of groups.[9] But, if the Nordishist agenda is to divide NorthCentral Europeans (NCEs) from South Europeans (SEs), then this agenda is served by equating South Europeans with non-European, often colored, ethnies.

If the agenda is to de-emphasize the Republican voting pattern of Southern European groups, and hence de-emphasize their shared ethno-political interests with NorthCentral Europeans, then such a lumping scheme may serve that purpose as well. In the absence of absolute verifiable statistics, I shall make a case (see below) that Italian-Americans (the core Southern European group in the USA) have become an important player in conservative Republican politics and strategies. We can also reasonably assume (alas, without hard data) that Third World non-European groups such as Iranians and Turks, who identify outside of the White West, are more likely to vote for liberal Democratic candidates. Thus, lumping such groups with Italian-Americans would skew the SE voting results more in the direction of Democratic voting.

Contrary to the assertions of some that there is a difference in racial political interests between Americans of NorthCentral European descent (postulated to be mainly conservative Republican voters), and gentile Americans of Southern European, mostly Italian, extraction (postulated to be predominantly liberal Democrats), is the political reality of recent decades. William Schneider, in the July 1988 issue of *Atlantic Monthly*, discusses the new demographic alignment of White ethnic voting patterns, which gives an overview of White ethnic political preferences at the end of the Reagan era.[10] Here we read that:

> Among white Catholics, however, the trend is clear. 'We've got to watch ourselves', said John Marino, the executive director of the New York state Democratic Party 'We've lost the Irish and Italian ethnic votes.' Italian voters in particular have become a new and important Republican constituency. They tend to dominate the party in the New York suburbs.[11] Also: "Conservative Italian voters have largely displaced old-line WASP liberals in the Republican party [of New York]" according to Timothy Russert: " [it is] becoming more and more true that Italian ethnics are likely to vote Republican."[12] And one reason that kept on coming up to explain this voting pattern was the "elephant in the room": RACE.

Of course it can be argued that voting for George Bush - a pro-diversity neo-conservative who played the "Hispanic card" during the election - is no indicator of pro-White racial sympathies. On the other hand, it can be argued that he was viewed as the "lesser of two evils" by the White electorate, and that may be, in part, true. But, do we know what the motivations of Bush voters were? In the case of Ronald Reagan, who talked about issues in a pro-White

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way (but of course did nothing in this direction while in office), one could certainly make a connection between voting for Reagan and racial views. In the case of the junior Bush, this is unlikely.

It would be interesting to know how much of the racial liberalism from the Bush-Dole-Kemp-Bush, Jr. crowd has destroyed the Reagan coalition, and eaten away at White ethnic Republican voters. There does not seem to be any clear data or opinion on this one way or another. But one thing that the *Atlantic Monthly* article does make clear: White ethnics, including and especially Italian-Americans, will support political programs and candidates that are pro-Euro-American, and that there is no intrinsic "ethnic gap" within the Euro-American community. Let the Republicans move to the right on race and any (as of yet unsubstantiated) leakage of White ethnic Republican support would be reversed.

The last fundamental flaw in TEG is that it fails to reasonably explain, in any manner consistent with reality, how and why the interests of SEs should differ from those of NCEs. As McCulloch suggests with his use of the word "enclaves," SEs tend to be concentrated in or around urban areas in heavily populated coastal states: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and California. These "enclaves" are in proximity to large colored/colored immigrant populations; hence, SEs suffer from racial problems - integration, immigration, affirmative action, crime, destruction of and displacement from living spaces - just as much or more so than any other Euro-American groups. There is no logical reason whatsoever for SEs to ally themselves with a liberal Democrat agenda that supports the above mentioned destructive racial trends. Indeed, as the cited *Atlantic Monthly* article strongly suggests, it is precisely these issues of race that has caused the shift to the political right of White ethnics, including SEs.

Thus, we can ask: how do the interests of an Italian-American differ from that of his Irish-American neighbor? How do the interests of a German-American "Borreby" differ from that of a Greek-American "Mediterranid?" The answer: they do not; the interests are similar. *Indeed, it seems that the only real and substantial difference in group interests is the Nordishist desire to ghettoize SEs, and SE resistance to that desire.*

One can see therefore how TEG could become a self-fulfilling prophecy. We start with a situation in which SEs, particularly Italian-Americans, are in the position to form a key part of a core racially-conservative Republican bloc. However, if the GOP becomes an exclusively NCE organization, overtly hostile to SEs, then it would be expected that many SEs may be forced, against all their inclinations, to support Democrats. Then the Nordishists can say: "we told you so, the SEs are Democrats." Such a scenario may be desirable from the point of view of those who wish to alienate SEs, but it is disastrous from the viewpoint of building a Euro-American political movement to secure racial rights and racial survival. It should be clear from these arguments that I believe there is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

room for both NCEs and SEs in a pro-White political activist movement. There may even be room for both Nordishist concerns and SEs, if the Nordishists would stop blatantly disregarding the rights and interests of SEs, and stop misrepresenting SE interests (e.g. TEG) in order to promote intra-Euro-American division.

Summary

Population-based interests form at the level of the (ancestral) ethnic groups (and race), not at the level of phenotype. There are no real differences in socio-political interests between NCEs and SEs (defining SEs as of European descent, not as an amorphous lumping of all non-NCE Caucasians). Real ethnic voting trends point to the possibility of building pan-European pro-Euro-American political programs in America. No Euro-American gentiles need be excluded from this prospective political alignment. The more Euro-Americans we have, the more powerful the new political alignment will be.[13]

---

*Michael Rienzi, the pseudonym of a biological scientist living in the Northeast, is the author of the December 2000 cover story "Race is a Myth? The left distorts science for political purposes" in A**merican Renaissance**.*

End Notes

1. Pierre L. van den Berghe *The Ethnic Phenomenon*, Praeger, NY 1981
2. http://www.world-of-dawkins.com
3. http://www.csulb.edu/~kmacd/ethnic.htm
4. We may well ask what happens if a non-NCE Caucasian undergoes cosmetic alterations and now exhibits a NCE physical appearance / phenotype. Is this person now considered part of the NCE group, and now part of the NCE "conservative Republican" political block? If the answer is yes (!!!), then this would imply that the "Ethnic Gap" can be dealt with via plastic surgery and the like. In the more likely event that the answer is no, then we see once again the primacy of actual biocultural ancestry (ethnicity) over subjective interpretations of phenotype in the form of physical appearance.
5. For example, a "Borreby father" with a "Nordic son." Or, the idea that a single set of parents could produce siblings who represent "Nordic", "Alpinid", and "Mediterranean" "racial types."
6. Van den Burghe, Ibid.
7. Carleton Stevens Coon *The Races of Europe*, MacMillan, NY, 1939.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

8. See for example, Nei and Roychoudhury, "Evolutionary relationships of human populations on a global scale", *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 10, pp. 927-943, 1993. Also see the article by the late Dr. Glayde Whitney in the March 1997 issue of *American Renaissance*, which included a chart of population genetic relatedness, based on the Nei and Roychoudhury data.

9. Van den Burghe, Ibid.

10. http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/policamp/insider.htm

11. This comment makes clear how reality is quite different than what is proposed in TEG. Apparently, in areas where we find SE "enclaves", Italian-Americans may in fact be more conservative than some NCE groups, or at least they were more conservative at the end of the Reagan era. We should also consider that a string of events, from the Newark riots to the Howard Beach/Bensonhurst conflicts, have shifted focus on Italian-Americans (primarily of Southern Italian descent) as the most "racist" of Euro-American ethnic groups.

12. Indeed, as this article makes clear, even the Italian-American Mario Cuomo had trouble winning election in New York State because of the conservatism of Italian-American voters. Cuomo was a liberal Democrat. We have to consider that for roughly a century after the end of the Civil War, White southerners - overwhelmingly NEs of Anglo-Saxon descent - were a solid Democratic Party bloc vote, no less than the "White ethnics." However, the "Solid South" shifted to the Republicans for the same reasons as did the White ethnics - the perception that their racial interests were not being met by the increasingly hard-left, pro-colored Democrats. Any talk of a "geographical gap" between the North and South of America is nonsensical today and outdated. So it is for an "ethnic gap" between NCEs and SEs.

13. While this essay concentrates on TEG, I find many serious problems with the "Racial Compact" site beyond the scope of this analysis. In general, consistent with the problems of TEG, the "Racial Compact" site, in my opinion, disregards the racial rights of non-Nordish Euro-Americans - and is thus internally incompatible with the racial rights the site ostensibly advocates. Finally, there is more to Western man than narrow biological reductionism - whether this be phenotypic, genetic, or ancestral. Ethnies are bio-cultural entities, and the peoples of the West - Europeans - are defined both by a predominantly West-Caucasian (i.e., European) ancestry as well as historical and cultural connections to Western civilization. We should not get so carried away by cephalic indices and gene frequencies that we forget this reality.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the European Ethnic Gap

A Rejoinder to Rienzi and Torriani

Richard McCulloch

Messrs. Rienzi and Torriani make some specific criticisms of my article "The Ethnic Gap" in the Fall 2001 issue of *The Occidental Quarterly* and some broad criticisms of my work in general as found on my website (http://www.racialcompact.com). Before addressing the specific criticisms, I think I should address the fundamental issue that underlies their general criticism and disagreement with my work.

I am an American of Northern European ancestry and race. I love my race and I want it to continue to exist. In normal times this would not need to be said. But these are not normal times. After over 5,000 years of existing without any danger to their existence the peoples of Northern Europe, and the populations of Northern European ancestry and race in America and Australia, are being destroyed. I do not want them to be destroyed, so my efforts have been directed toward their preservation.

Racial preservation has to be based on racial reality. It has to face the facts, ask the right questions and provide the right answers, however difficult they may be. What is destroying the Northern European peoples? How can they be saved from destruction? How can they be preserved? What is required for their preservation and what needs to be done to achieve it?

The Northern European peoples are being destroyed by multiracialism, the condition of different races existing together in the same territory and society. Their destruction is an unavoidable consequence of multiracialism. They simply cannot continue to exist in a multiracial society. This is a fact of racial reality, a reality of race, of what a race is.

The traits by which we define and identify race are not just individual traits but the traits of a population. A race is a stabilized breeding population, consisting in each of its generations of different individuals who are the passing components in the continuum of its potentially immortal existence. So long as each generation passes on its genes proportionately to its next generation the gene pool, and thus the race as a whole, does not change, but remains the same in each generation, although the individuals composing its population will vary. So long as the genes remain the same and other genes are not introduced

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from outside the population to change it -- either by changing the proportions of the existing elements or, more drastically, by adding entirely different elements -- the race will remain the same and be preserved in its entirety.

The concept of racial environment is critical to the understanding of racial reality. The racial environment consists of the types and proportions of racial elements within a stabilized breeding population. It is presumed that the different racial elements in a given society, sharing the same space, will eventually intermix, forming a single breeding population and gene pool. A race is created and preserved in a certain racial environment, a range of certain racial types in certain proportions, and this is the environment required for its preservation or continued existence. If the racial environment is changed the gene pool is also changed and the race cannot continue to exist in the same form, but will be transformed or shifted in the direction of the new racial environment. A change in the racial environment eventually causes a corresponding change in the racial gene pool, and this in turn causes a corresponding change in the race, a racial shift toward the traits of the new elements.

As my critics note, I use the term "Nordish" to refer to Northern Europeans, which I will begin to do at this point, for stylistic reasons that should be obvious. (I do not, however, use Mr. Rienzi's term "Nordishist.")

The Northern European or Nordish racial types evolved and have existed for over 5,000 years in a particular racial environment in which certain proportions of a certain range of racial types have maintained a stable balance or equilibrium. This is the racial environment in which the Nordish racial types evolved, and it is the racial environment that is required for their continued existence or preservation. If the racial environment is changed by the introduction of outside elements the racial proportions within the population will be changed, upsetting and destabilizing the racial balance.

The introduction of less distinct Nordish types will cause a decrease in the proportions of the more distinct types and -- if the change is great enough -- their eventual extinction. The introduction of totally new and incompatible non-Nordish, or even non-European, racial types upsets the balance in the population even more drastically, destroying the racial environment that is required for Nordish racial preservation. This results in the extinction of the more distinct Nordish types first and eventually the general extinction of the entire Nordish population. This is what is now happening to the Nordish peoples of Western Europe, America, Canada and Australia. Their racial environments, which they require for their continued existence, are being destroyed -- or have already been destroyed -- by the introduction of different racial elements. They have been changed into multiracial environments in which the Nordish racial types cannot continue to exist. The destruction of the Nordish racial environment by multiracialism eventually means the destruction of the Nordish race.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The underlying reason for the general objection of Messrs. Rienzi and Torriani to my work, if we cut to the chase, is that I make a racial distinction between Northern and Southern Europeans. If not for that I suspect they would find little to disagree with in my work, but for that they broaden their criticism to include almost the entirety of my work.

My reason for making this distinction is basic Nordish racial preservationism, as plain and simple as it gets. Racial reality is either-or. You cannot have it both ways. It is one or the other. You can either preserve the Nordish race or mix it with other races, but you cannot have both. Extensive intermixture with Mediterraneans will have consequences that cannot be responsibly evaded or denied. The consequence is a racial shift away from the Nordish types and toward the Mediterranean types. The greater the extent of intermixture the greater will be this shift. The most distinct Nordish phenotypes would be the first lost as a result of this shift, followed by the less distinct types. Eventually, if the extent of intermixture and the resulting racial shift is great enough, only the more generalized Nordish types might survive in any significant numbers. There are no studies detailing the specifics of this process (at least not in humans), and no figures are maintained on the Nordish phenotypes in the population. Thus there are no means to rigorously track, document or study any racial shift, including the shift that has already occurred due to the blending of Northern and Central Europeans, and to a lesser extent Southern Europeans. But any person with a modicum of racial sense and sensibility must be sensible to the fact that it would occur.

My own racial sense and sensibilities inform my belief that a general intermixture of Northern and Southern Europeans would be sufficient to make the more distinct Nordish types effectively extinct, and the less distinct types much less common. As a Nordish racial preservationist I therefore want to prevent a general intermixture of Northern and Southern Europeans, and as a racial realist I know that the only effective way to prevent intermixture is separation. And that is the rub, the heart of the matter, the general point of disagreement between Messrs. Rienzi and Torriani and myself. And it is one that I cannot change consistent with racial reality, and cannot yield on without surrendering the very essence of the Nordish race, and defeating the very purpose of Nordish preservation.

Admittedly, the racial differences between Northern and Southern Europeans seem minor, some would say even trivial, compared to the differences between Europeans and the races of sub-Saharan Africa or East Asia. Certainly they are only a fraction of these differences, and certainly there is even a degree of racial overlap between the native populations of Northern and Southern Europe. But the racial reality is that the differences are great enough, even more than enough, to cause the extinction of the more distinct

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nordish types if there is sufficient intermixture between them. The denial of those differences, and their effects, would prove fatal for the distinct Nordish types.

What is the extent of the racial differences between Northern and Southern Europeans? Would anyone have difficulty distinguishing the native population of Stockholm from that of Naples, of Copenhagen from Madrid, of London from Seville? As indicated above, there are varying degrees of racial overlap or similarity in the individual members of the different populations of Europe. Some members of the Austrian and Italian populations -- for example -- resemble each other, yet the populations as a whole do not overlap, but are clearly distinct. If you took a group of 100 individuals from each European country, with each group being representative -- in types and proportions -- of their respective populations, the average person would have no difficulty distinguishing between the Italian group and the Austrian group, as each group would have a large proportion of individuals of racial types that are either completely absent or very rare in the other group.

However, if the two groups were mixed together the average person, or even an expert, would be less than 100% accurate in sorting the 200 individuals into their respective population groupings. This is because there is an overlap in the racial composition of the two populations. There is also an overlap between the Italian and British populations, only the differences are greater and the extent of overlap smaller. There is even less overlap between the native Scandinavian and Italian populations, so that a mixed group of representative individuals could probably be sorted with well over 90% accuracy. Each population forms a breeding group in which the proportions of the different types are stabilized in a balance that can continue indefinitely, maintaining the racial continuity of the population, so long as the proportions are not changed by the introduction of elements from outside the stabilized population.

The chart below is my attempt to provide an admittedly rough estimate of the phenotypic composition of the native European populations.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Scandinavia	35	50	13	2	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	17	55	25	3	-	-	-	-	-
N. Germany	15	55	25	5	-	-	-	-	-
East England	15	50	25	10	-	-	-	-	-
West England	10	43	30	15	2	-	-	-	-
Cntr. Germany	5	40	30	20	5	-	-	-	-
S. Germany	-	20	35	30	15	-	-	-	-
Austria	-	15	25	35	20	5	-	-	-
N. France	-	5	23	32	30	10	-	-	-
S. France	-	-	15	25	35	20	5	-	-
N. Italy	-	-	10	20	25	25	15	5	-
Spain	-	-	3	15	20	22	20	15	5
S. Italy	-	-	2	12	18	20	23	18	7
Tunisia	-	-	-	-	-	5	10	20	30

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The chart on the preceding page contains percentage estimates of phenotypic groups in the native populations of the western Caucasian region, illustrating the composition of the different racial environments and the extent of overlap. The reader may disagree with my estimates, and I assume they are not precisely accurate, but I believe the concept is valid, and I assume the estimates are sufficiently accurate to give a valid illustration of the concept.

Phenotypic group A consists of the most distinct Northern European phenotypes found only in Northern Europe (represented on this chart by Scandinavia, the Netherlands, England, and northern and central Germany). *Phenotypic group B* consists of the most common Northern European phenotypes which can still be regarded as distinctly Northern European although they are also found as minority elements in Central Europe (represented by southern Germany, Austria and northern France). *Phenotypic group C* consists of generalized phenotypes that are common throughout Northern and Central Europe and are also present as a minor element in Southern Europe (represented by Italy, Spain and southern France). *Phenotypic group D* consists of more generalized phenotypes that are found throughout Western Europe but are most common in Central Europe. *Phenotypic group E* consists of phenotypes that are common throughout Southern and Central Europe but are absent or very rare in the native populations of Northern Europe. *Phenotypic group F* consists of phenotypes that are common in Southern Europe, present in small numbers in Central Europe, but absent from Northern Europe. *Phenotypic group G* consists of distinct "Mediterranean" phenotypes that are common in Southern Europe, present as a minority element in North Africa, but absent from the native populations of Northern and Central Europe. *Phenotypic group H* consists of more distinct "Mediterranean" phenotypes that are common in both Southern Europe and North Africa. *Phenotypic group I* consists of the most distinct "Mediterranean" phenotypes found among the native populations of Southern Europe, but more common in North Africa and the Middle East.

In my partition proposal phenotypes not normally found in the native populations of Northern and Central Europe would be separated from the Nordish population. This racial dividing line would run through the F group of phenotypes in the above chart. Yet even in this proposal the long-term survival of the more distinct Nordish types in the Nordish-American population would be far from certain, and if they did survive they would certainly be much less common. The resulting racial environment would represent a considerable racial shift away from the one in which they existed for the last 5,000 years. There are always racial costs involved in any significant racial shift, and those costs have their greatest effect on the most distinct side of the racial range.

In Northern Europe itself, the racial dividing line should be based on the native populations themselves, and be stricter than the standard applied in the U.S. The immigration of additional generalized C or D phenotypes from Central or Southern Europe into Northern Europe would upset the balance of the racial environment, lowering the proportions of the more distinct Northern

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European types and, if sufficient, threatening their continued existence. This is true even though the native populations already contain those phenotypes, as a change in the proportions of phenotypes causes a change in the racial environment and gene pool, and thus a racial shift away from the more distinct types. Also, it should be noted that the generalized C and D phenotypes of Central and Southern Europe are not genotypically equivalent to the C and D phenotypes of Northern Europe. The native C and D phenotypes in Northern Europe usually carry recessive A and B genes in their genotypes, whereas this is usually not the case with C and D phenotypes in Central or Southern Europe.

Unfortunately, there are political costs incurred by racial separation, just as there are racial costs incurred by the lack of separation. The groups selected for separation from the Nordish population can generally be expected to oppose the separation. That is why I separated Northern and Central Europeans (NCEs) from other ethno-racial groups in my discussion of the prospects for building a pro-Nordish political movement in "The Ethnic Gap," as it could not be assumed that the non-NCEs would support the ultimate Nordish interest in separation. And that is why Messrs. Rienzi and Torriani oppose my proposal, and the reason for their general criticism of my work.

Both political and racial costs should be minimized to what is absolutely necessary, but if costs there must be, as a racial preservationist I am much more willing to incur political costs than racial costs, which involve a racial shift away from what I wish to preserve. Racial costs involve our being, what we are, and once incurred the political costs of reversing them (if it is still possible to reverse them) are usually prohibitive, and certainly far greater than the costs of preventing them. Should we sacrifice part of ourselves, lose the most distinct parts of our race, for political reasons? For me there is no political interest so compelling as to justify the extinction of the most distinct Nordish types, and no political cost so great as to compel me to accept racial policies that would have that result.

Is there anything we could offer the groups selected for separation that would significantly lessen their opposition to it? What could be done to accommodate those groups, to lessen their opposition to separation, and possibly even gain some measure of support? Certainly whatever could be done within reason, that does not defeat the purpose of Nordish racial preservation or sacrifice the legitimate interests of the Nordish-American population, that would be worthwhile and not in vain, that addresses legitimate concerns without catering to obstructionism, should be done.

It is my hope that we could be partners rather than adversaries in this enterprise, and that the interests of all could be adequately served and protected. But to the extent that interests do conflict, the primacy of the Nordish peoples in North America should be an established principle. Their interests should have priority and be given precedence. They have a much greater interest in North America, having committed a far greater part of their existence and being to the continent, than any other people. Until a little over a century ago it was clearly their country, and in spite of the ongoing process of their dispossession since that time they still have far more at stake in it than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do any others. As a Nordish-American, my ancestors' vision and realization of a transcontinental nation is still my vision of what Nordish America should be, and what I want a post-partition Nordish America to be.

Turning to some of the specific criticisms, the term "Nordish" simply means "Northern European" when used in the racial sense. The racial term "Northern European" in general usage refers to all the native peoples of Northern Europe, not distinguishing between Nordics, Borrebys and Brüünns, but, in Mr. Rienzi's terms, lumping them all together as I do with the term "Nordish." That said, I have found that the people who object to the term "Nordish" are those who object to any distinction being made between Northern and Southern Europeans, or to any semantic tool that makes it easier to make that distinction. The same people also tend to object to the use of the racial term "Mediterranean," in general usage referring to all the native peoples of the Mediterranean region, as it also makes a distinction between Northern and Southern Europeans.

Regarding the contention that modern Nordics are more closely related to Mediterraneans than to their Brüünn and Borreby countrymen, general usage -- including anthropology and genetics -- does distinguish between Northern and Southern Europeans, but does not distinguish between the Nordic, Borreby and Brüünn types of Northern Europe. There is a very simple reason for this. Most people, including most scientists, have never heard of the Brüünn and Borreby types, are unaware of their existence, and do not know how to distinguish them from each other or from Nordics. Some who are aware of them do not believe they represent different racial types but only normal individual and regional variation within the Northern European population.

Certainly John Baker was aware of them, yet he makes no mention of them in his 1974 work *Race* (pp. 217-220), referring only to "Nordids" in Scandinavia and northern Germany, although he does clearly differentiate between "Nordids" and "Mediterranids." And there is good reason for this, for whatever the prehistoric origin and derivation of these types might be, the overriding fact is that for the last 5,000 years they have been part of the same populations, blending together to the extent that few people can distinguish them either by phenotype or genotype. I think almost everyone, including Mr. Rienzi, would be able to distinguish the predominantly Nordic populations of Oslo and Stockholm from the Mediterranean populations of Naples and Madrid very easily, but would have considerable difficulty distinguishing them from the predominantly Borreby populations of Stavanger, Malmöö and Copenhagen.

In my opinion Carleton Coon's classic 1939 work *The Races of Europe* presents the most accurate and detailed description and classification of the modern races of Europe that I have seen, but I have never thought of it as the last word on European prehistory and racial origins. This area of study is still very open and the subject of considerable debate. In the past few years several genetic studies have contributed some insights. For example, a genetic study reported in the May 10, 2001 issue of *Nature*, "Linkage disequilibrium in the human genome" (p.199) had findings suggesting "that the long-range LD pattern is general in northern Europeans," and asked, "What was the nature

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the population event that created the long-range LD? The event could be specific to northern Europe, which was substantially depopulated during the Last Glacial Maximum (30,000-15,000 years ago), and subsequently re-colonized by a small number of founders." This report received considerable publicity in the popular press, often distorted and falsified with a multiracialist bias. The *National Post Online* release dated May 10, 2001 was perhaps the most accurate and included the following relevant passages:

> All humans of northern European ancestry are descended from a tiny group of cave men -- perhaps only 10 people, and no more than 50 -- researchers have discovered. The result is that hundreds of millions of their descendants now carry vast amounts of identical DNA. The small group formed a bottleneck, squeezing all the genes of northern Europe through a few individuals 30,000 to 50,000 years ago, long after humans left their first home in Africa."

This genetic study clearly does not differentiate between Nordics and other Northern Europeans, but assumes a common ancestry for all Northern Europeans going back 15,000 years or more. It also indicates a much earlier date of divergence, and more distant relationship, between Northern and Southern Europeans than is often supposed.

The following quotes might help to clarify Coon's opinion on the relationship between modern Nordics and Mediterraneans. From Coon's 1951 work, *Caravan: the story of the Middle East*, (p. 154):

> Our area, from Morocco to Afghanistan, is the homeland and cradle of the Mediterranean race. Mediterraneans are found also in Spain, Portugal, most of Italy, Greece and the Mediterranean islands, and in all these places, as in the Middle East, they form the major genetic element in the local populations. In a dark-skinned and finer-boned form they are also found as the major population element in Pakistan and northern India.

(It should be noted that the modern Nordic homelands are not included in this description of the geographic distribution of the Mediterranean race.) From Coon's 1965 work, *The Living Races of Man*, (p. 54):

> Mediterranean and Nordic populations may be distinguished both in Europe and in West Asia during the span of the Mesolithic. It is a moot point whether the Nordic skeletal type of Neolithic Northern Europe came from the West or the East, or from both.

This indicates that Nordics and Mediterraneans were already distinguishable from each other at least as early as the Mesolithic, and that Nordics were already in Northern Europe at least as early as the Neolithic. And given that, with regard to the racial affinities of the modern Nordics I think that we can join Coon in saying that it is really a moot point where they came from, because they have been Northern Europeans for at least 5,000 years.

One of the most serious problems facing racial preservationism is ignorance of the consequences of multiracialism, and specifically of the effects of racial intermixture. Not only do many people still believe in the fantasy that multiracialism will not result in large-scale racial intermixture, they and many others are unaware of what the results of intermixture would be, and believe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the fantasy that even with large-scale intermixture the different races, including the Nordish race, will still continue to exist without significant change. In this common fantasy, which seems to be the dominant -- and politically correct -- senseless mindset of the popular culture, racial intermixture would not cause a racial shift and would not result in any racial types being lost or even becoming much less common. This ignorance of the most basic racial reality is so serious that it could prove fatal to the racial preservationist cause, a fatal fantasy that prevents awareness of the racial destruction that is even now taking place in front of our eyes, to which we are all witnesses, by denying its possibility.

I believe that anything that exists in physical reality can be measured and calculated. Real world physical actions have real world physical effects and results that can be accurately described. Acting on this belief, I developed a scale of Nordish racial assimilability to calculate the results of racial intermixture on the Nordish race. (http://www.racialcompact.com/averageisdestiny.html) The scale is much more accurate with population averages than with individuals, and the larger the population the more accurate the average. But after the first generations of interracial crossing have passed, and the blend becomes more stabilized with each generation, with ever less individual variation, the scale would become increasingly accurate in calculating individual results as well. Mr. Rienzi objects to my scale, not on the grounds that my calculations, estimates and predictions are inaccurate, nor that my scale is flawed in design, but on the grounds that the very concept of being able to calculate or predict the genetics of racial intermixture is invalid. In attacking the validity of the concept he basically adopts the obscurantist position that the effects of intermixture are unknowable. This is inconsistent with our long experience with the genetics of animal husbandry and stock breeding, in which the genetic and phenotypic effects of intermixture can be predicted with a very high degree of accuracy. Though there is a normal aversion to admitting it, the same genetic principles that govern the mixture of animals govern the mixture of humans as well, and the results can be calculated with the same degree of accuracy. This too is part of racial reality. The effects of racial intermixture are governed by physical reality, not fantasy.

Messrs. Rienzi and Torriani object to my use of phenotype to define race. Phenotype is the totality of our physical or morphological traits or characteristics. As the definitions of race in most dictionaries show, physical traits are the recognized and customary means of determining, identifying and defining race. As the great anthropologist E.A. Hooton wrote in *Up From the Ape*, "The classification of organisms has to begin with phenotypes (p. 439)." Phenotype is nature's method of racial and species identification. It consists of everything we experience with our senses -- odor, feel and sound as well as sight. Every living creature, from insects to man, distinguishes and recognizes its own kind based on phenotype, by what they experience with their senses.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is most critical in the selection of mates, and in general nature has been very successful in enabling every species to almost unerringly identify its own kind by phenotype in the selection of mates. It is also the means we all use to identify race.

All of us, in our everyday lives, beginning in childhood, have racially classified or identified many tens of thousands of persons, most of it automatic, unconscious and involuntary, taking no longer than a split fraction of a second, including people we pass in the mall or on the street, in our schools, in social settings, in every event we attend and everywhere we go. For nearly all of us, every single one of those classifications was by phenotype, using an important ability with which we are equipped by nature. How many people have any of us racially identified by genetic sequences? How many by anthropometric measurements? For nearly all of us, the answer to these two questions, regarding the other recognized methods of racial identification other than phenotype, is zero. Mr. Rienzi disparages phenotype as a method of racial identification. How many thousands of people has he racially identified by phenotype? How many by other methods? Has he ever racially identified anyone by methods other than phenotype? If so, he is one of a very few, as only biologists and physical anthropologists with specialized training and equipment are able to identify race with means other than those with which nature equipped us, and those other means are not necessarily more accurate.

Mr. Torriani suggests cultural artifacts as a means of racial identification, but culture is not race and the two should not be confused. A person of any race could adopt the culture and artifacts of any other race, as many millions of Africans and Asians have adopted the culture of the West, but they are still not of that race.

I do not ignore genetics or ancestry as a means of racial classification, but consider them to be supplemental to phenotype, not a replacement for it. I think my critics create a false dichotomy between phenotype and genetics and ancestry. In my opinion, phenotype is normally consistent with genetics and ancestry, being their physical expression, and indicating them with a high degree of accuracy. Phenotype is adequate for racial classification. There is no need for genetic testing that would impose such huge political costs that suggesting them is likely to be a common obstructionist tactic.

And what would genetic testing and ancestry research reveal? Actresses Kim Bassinger and Farrah Fawcett are reported to be 1/8th Amerindian in ancestry. They are distinctly Nordish in phenotype, so the genes that determine their phenotype have been almost totally inherited from their seven Nordish great-grandparents, although some other genes they inherited from their one Amerindian great-grandparent might be the ones measured by genetic testing, classifying them as Amerindian. There are probably other persons who are 1/8th Amerindian in ancestry whose genes for phenotype are predominantly Amerindian (an example of the individual instability of early generation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crosses), but the genes that would be tested would be European, classifying them as European. According to the Nei and Roychoudhury study cited by Mr. Rienzi in note 7 the Finns are essentially the same genetic distance from the Mongoloid Japanese (.054%) as are the Italians (.055%). Yet Mr. Torriani agonizes over the implications of a study that finds a "substantial" (?) portion of Finnish Y chromosomes are of Mongoloid origin. What importance should we give to the origin of Y chromosomes, or any other single genetic sequence that might be measured, as a determinant of racial identification if inconsistent with phenotype? I say none, and thus see no need to develop policies to deal with them, so Mr. Torriani can stop agonizing over hidden genes and their implications and focus on what can be seen, as nature intended.

Phenotype is central to race. It is racial identity. A race is more than phenotype, but it is nothing without its phenotype. A race is not a disembodied thing without face or form. Phenotype is its physical body, its face and form. The devaluation or denigration of phenotype is a devaluation and denigration of race. The delegitimization of phenotype as a matter not worthy of concern is a delegitimization of racial preservation as a matter not worthy of concern. The belittlement of phenotype and the denial of its importance are a central part of the logic and argument of anti-preservationists, and a clear indication of opposition to racial preservation.

We live in a world of phenotypes, of tangible physical being. Phenotype is what we directly experience and perceive with our senses. It is what we are attached to. It is what we love. It is what we want to preserve. And its preservation is consistent with, and necessary for, the preservation of everything else associated with our race and every other part of its being. So as a racial preservationist, seeking to preserve the Nordish race, I will continue to work for the preservation of the Nordish phenotypes and advocate the measures required for their preservation.

Richard McCulloch is the author of ***The Racial Compact*** *(1994),* The ***Nordish Quest*** *(1989),* ***Destiny of Angels*** *(1986), and* ***The Ideal and Destiny*** *(1982). For additional information see: www.racialcompact.com.*

References

Baker, John R. *Race*, Oxford University Press, 1974.

Coon, Carleton *Caravan*, Henry Holt & Co., 1951.

— *Living Races of Man*, Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

— *The Races of Europe*, The MacMillan Co., 1939.

Hooton, Earnest A. *Up From The Ape*, The MacMillan Co., 1931, (revised edition 1946).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Julius Evola On Tradition And The Right (*La Vera Destra*)

Men Among the Ruins:
Post-War Reflections of a Radical Traditionalist
Julius Evola
Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 2002
$22.00 US

xvi + 310 pp.

Reviewed by E. Christian Kopff

Baron Julius Evola (1899-1974) was an important Italian intellectual, although he despised the term. As poet and painter, he was the major Italian representative of Dadaism (1916-1922). Later he became the leading Italian exponent of the intellectually rigorous esotericism of René Guénon (1886-1951). He enjoyed an international reputation as the author of books on magic, alchemy and eastern religious traditions and won the respect of such important scholars as Mircea Eliade and Giuseppe Tucci. His book on early Buddhism, *The Doctrine of Awakening*,[1] which was translated in 1951, established his reputation among English-speaking esotericists. In 1983, Inner Traditions International, directed by Ehud Sperling, published Evola's 1958 book, *The Metaphysics of Sex*, which it reprinted as *Eros and the Mysteries of Love* in 1992, the same year it published his 1949 book on *Tantra, The Yoga of Power*.[2]

The marketing appeal of the topic of sex is obvious. Both books, however, are serious studies, not sex manuals. Since then Inner Traditions has reprinted *The Doctrine of Awakening* and published many of Evola's esoteric books, including studies of alchemy and magic,[3] and what Evola himself considered his most important exposition of his beliefs, *Revolt Against the Modern World*.[4]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Europe Evola is known not only as an esotericist, but also as a brilliant and incisive right-wing thinker. During the 1980's most of his books, New Age and political, were translated into French under the aegis of Alain de Benoist, the leader of the French Nouvelle Droite.[5] Books and articles by Evola have been translated into German and published in every decade since the 1930's.[6]

Discussion of Evola's politics reached North America slowly. In the 1980's political scientists Thomas Sheehan, Franco Ferraresi, and Richard Drake wrote about him unsympathetically, blaming him for Neo-Fascist terrorism.[7] In 1990 the esoteric journal, *Gnosis*, devoted part of an issue to Evola. Robin Waterfield, a classicist and author of a book on René Guénon, contributed a thoughtful appreciation of his work on the basis of French translations.[8] Italian esotericist Elémire Zolla discussed Evola's development accurately but ungenerously.[9] The essay by *Gnosis* editor Jay Kinney was driven by an almost hysterical fear of the word "Fascist." He did not appear to have read Evola's books in any language, called the 1983 edition of *The Metaphysics of Sex* Evola's "only book translated into English" and concluded "Evola's esotericism appears to be well outside of the main currents of Western tradition. It remains to be seen whether his Hermetic virtues can be disentangled from his political sins. Meanwhile, he serves as a persuasive argument for the separation of esoteric 'Church and State.'"[10]

With the publication of *Men Among the Ruins: Post-War Reflections of a Radical Traditionalist*,[11] English speakers can read Evola's political views for themselves. They will find that the text, in Guido Stucco's workman-like translation, edited by Michael Moynihan, is guarded by a double firewall. Joscelyn Godwin's "Foreword" answers Jay Kinney's hysterical diatribe of 1990. Godwin defends publishing Evola's political writings by an appeal to "academic freedom," which works "with the tools of rationality and scholarship, unsullied by emotionality or subjective references" and favors making all of Evola's works available because "it would be academically dishonest to suppress anything." Godwin's high praise for *The Doctrine of Awakening* implicitly condemns Kinney's ignorance. Evola's books on esoteric topics reveal "one of the keenest minds in the field . . . The challenge to esotericists is that when Evola came down to earth, he was so 'incorrect' – by the received standards of our society. He was no fool; and he cannot possibly have been right . . . so what is one to make of it?"

Godwin's "Preface" is followed by an introduction of more than 100 pages by Austrian esotericist H. T. Hansen on "Julius Evola's Political Endeavors," translated from the 1991 German version of *Men Among the Ruins*,[12] with additional notes and corrections (called "Preface to the American Edition"). Hansen's introduction to *Revolt Against the Modern World*[13] is, with Robin Waterfield's *Gnosis* essay, the best short introduction to Evola in English. His

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

longer essay is essential for serious students, and Inner Traditions deserves warm thanks for publishing it. The major book on Evola is Christophe Boutin, *Politique et Tradition: Julius Evola dans le siècle (1898-1974)*.[14]

Readers of books published by Inner Traditions might have guessed Evola's politics. *The Mystery of the Grail*,[15] first published in 1937, praises the Holy Roman Empire as a great political force, led by Germans and Italians, which tried to unite Europe under the Nordic Ghibellines. Esotericists will probably guess that the title of *Revolt Against the Modern World* is an homage to *Crisis of the Modern World*,[16] the most accessible of René Guénon's many books. The variation is also a challenge. Evola and Guénon see the modern world as the fulfillment of the Hindu Kali Yuga, or Dark Age, that will end one cosmic cycle and introduce another. For Guénon the modern world is to be endured, but Evola believed that real men are not passive. His praise of "The World of Tradition" with its warrior aristocracies and sacral kingship is peppered with contempt for democracy, but New Age writers often make such remarks, just as scientists do. If you believe you know the truth, it is hard not to be contemptuous of a system that determines matters by counting heads and ignores the distinction between the knowledgeable and the ignorant.

Visionary Among Italian Conservative Revolutionaries

Evola was not only an important figure in Guénon's Integral Traditionalism, but also the leading Italian exponent of the Conservative Revolution in Germany, which included Carl Schmitt, Oswald Spengler, Gottfried Benn, and Ernst Jünger.[17] From 1934-43, Evola was editor of what we would now call the "op-ed" page of a major Italian newspaper (*Regime Fascista*) and published Conservative Revolutionaries and other right-wing and traditionalist authors.[18] He corresponded with Schmitt[19], translated Spengler's *Decline of the West* and Jünger's *An der Zeitmauer* (At the Time Barrier) into Italian and wrote the best introduction to Jünger's *Der Arbeiter* (The Worker), *"The Worker" in Ernst Jünger's Thought*.[20]

Spengler has been well served by translation into English, but other important figures of the Conservative Revolution had to wait a long time. Carl Schmitt's major works have been translated only in the past few decades.[21] Jünger's most important work of social criticism, *Der Arbeiter*, has never been translated.[22] The major scholarly book on the movement has never been translated, either.[23] It is a significant statement on the limits of expression in the United States that so many leftist mediocrities are published, while major European thinkers of the rank of Schmitt, Jünger and Evola have to wait so long for translation, if the day ever comes. It is certainly intriguing that a New Age press has undertaken the translation and publishing of Evola's books, with excellent introductions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The divorced wife of a respected free market economist once remarked to me, "Yale used to say that conservatives were just old-fashioned liberals."[24] People who accept that definition will be flabbergasted by Julius Evola. Like Georges Sorel, Oswald Spengler, Whittaker Chambers and Régis Debray, Evola insists that liberals and communists are in fundamental agreement on basic principles. This agreement is significant, because for Evola politics is an expression of basic principles and he never tires of repeating his own. The transcendent is real. Man's knowledge of his relationship to transcendence has been handed down from the beginning of human culture. This is Tradition, with a capital T. Human beings are tri-partite: body, soul and spirit. State and society are hierarchical and the clearer the hierarchy, the healthier the society. The worst traits of the modern world are its denial of transcendence, reductionist vision of man and egalitarianism.

These traits come together in what Evola called "la daimonìa dell'economia," translated by Stucco as "the demonic nature of the economy."[25] Real men exist to attain knowledge of the transcendent and to strive and accomplish heroically. The economy is only a tool to provide the basis for such accomplishments and to sustain the kind of society that permits the best to attain sanctity and greatness. The modern world denies this vision.

> In both individual and collective life the economic factor is the most important, real, and decisive one . . . An economic era is already by definition a fundamentally anarchical and anti-hierarchical era; it represents a subversion of the normal order . . . This subversive character is found in both Marxism and in its apparent nemesis, modern capitalism. Thus, it is absurd and deplorable for those who pretend to represent the political 'Right' to fail to leave the dark and small circle that is determined by the demonic power of the economy – a circle including capitalism, Marxism, and all the intermediate economic degrees. This should be firmly upheld by those today who are taking a stand against the forces of the Left. Nothing is more evident than that modern capitalism is just as subversive as Marxism. The materialistic view of life on which both systems are based is identical.[26]

Most conservatives do not like the leftist hegemony we live under, but they still want to cling to some aspect of modernity to preserve a toehold on respectability. Evola rejected the Enlightenment project lock, stock and barrel, and had little use for the Renaissance and the Reformation. His books ask us to take seriously the attempt to imagine an intellectual and political world that radically rejects the leftist worldview. He insists that those really opposed to the leftist regime, the true Right, are not embarrassed to use words like reactionary and counter revolutionary. If you are afraid of these words, you do not have the courage to stand up to the modern world.

He also countenances the German expression, Conservative Revolution, if properly understood. Revolution is acceptable only if it is true re-volution, a turning back to origins. Conservatism is valid only when it preserves the true Tradition. So loyalty to the bourgeois order is a false conservatism, because on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the level of principle, the bourgeoisie is an economic class, not a true aristocracy. That is one reason why at the end of his life, Evola was planning a right-wing journal to be called *The Reactionary*, in conscious opposition to the leading Italian conservative magazine, *Il Borghese*, "The Bourgeois."

For Evola the state creates the nation, not the opposite. Although Evola maintained a critical distance from Fascism and never joined the Fascist Party,[27] here he was in substantial agreement with Mussolini and the famous article on "Fascism" in the *Enciclopedia Italiana*, authored by the philosopher and educator, Giovanni Gentile. He disagreed strongly with the official philosophy of 1930's Germany. The Volk is not the basis of a true state, an imperium. Rather the state creates the people. Naturally, Evola rejected Locke's notion of the Social Contract, where rational, utilitarian individuals come together to give up some of their natural rights in order to preserve the most important one, the right to property. Evola also disagreed with Aristotle's idea that the state developed from the family. The state was created from Männerbünde, disciplined groups entered through initiation by men who were to become warriors and priests. The Männerbund, not the family, is the original basis of true political life.[28]

Evola saw his mission as finding men who could be initiated into a real warrior aristocracy, the Hindu kshatriya, to carry out Bismarck's "Revolution from above," what Joseph de Maistre called "not a counterrevolution, but the opposite of a revolution." This was not a mass movement, nor did it depend on the support of the masses, by their nature incapable of great accomplishments. Hansen thinks these plans were utopian, but Evola was in touch with the latest political science. The study of elites and their role in every society, especially liberal democracies, was virtually an Italian monopoly in the first half of the Twentieth century, carried on by men like Roberto Michels, Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto. Evola saw that nothing can be accomplished without leadership. The modern world needs a true elite to rescue it from its involution into materialism, egalitarianism and its obsession with the economy and to restore a healthy regime of order, hierarchy and spiritual creativity. When that elite is educated and initiated, then (and only then) a true state can be created and the Dark Age will come to an end.

Egalitarianism, Fascism, Race, and Roman Catholicism

Despite his criticism of the demagogic and populist aspects of Fascism and National Socialism, Evola believed that under their aegis Italy and Germany had turned away from liberalism and communism and provided the basis for a return to aristocracy, the restoration of the castes and the renewal of a social order based on Tradition and the transcendent. Even after their defeat in World War II, Evola believed that the fight was not over, although he became

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increasingly discouraged and embittered in the decades after the war. (Pain from a crippling injury suffered in an air raid may have contributed to this feeling.)

Although Evola believed that the transcendent was essential for a true revival, he did not look to the Catholic Church for leadership. *Men Among the Ruins* was published in 1953, when the official position of the Church was still strongly anti-Communist and Evola had lived through the 1920s and 1930s when the Vatican signed the Concordat with Mussolini. So his analysis of the Church, modified but not changed for the second edition in 1967, is impressive as is his prediction that the Church would move to the left.

> After the times of De Maistre, Bonald, Donoso Cortés, and the Syllabus have passed, Catholicism has been characterized by political maneuvering . . . Inevitably, the Church's sympathies must gravitate toward a democratic-liberal political system. Moreover, Catholicism had for a long time espoused the theory of 'natural right,' which hardly agrees with the positive and differentiated right, on which a strong and hierarchical State can be built . . . Militant Catholics like Maritain had revived Bergson's formula according to which 'democracy is essentially evangelical'; they tried to demonstrate that the democratic impulse in history appears as a temporal manifestation of the authentic Christian and Catholic spirit . . . By now, the categorical condemnations of modernism and progressivism are a thing of the past . . . When today's Catholics reject the 'medieval residues' of their tradition; when Vatican II and its implementations have pushed for debilitating forms of 'bringing things up to date'; when popes uphold the United Nations (a ridiculous hybrid and illegitimate organization) practically as the prefiguration of a future Christian ecumene – this leaves no doubt in which direction the Church is being dragged. All things considered, Catholicism's capability of providing an adequate support for a revolutionary-conservative and traditionalist movement must be resolutely denied.[29]

Although his 1967 analysis mentions Vatican II, Evola's position on the Catholic Church went back to the 1920's, when after his early Dadaism he was developing a philosophy based on the traditions of India, the Far East and ancient Rome under the influence of Arturo Reghini (1878-1946).[30] Reghini introduced Evola to Guénon's ideas on Tradition and his own thinking on Roman "Pagan Imperialism" as an alternative to the Twentieth Century's democratic ideals and plutocratic reality. Working with a leading Fascist ideologue, Giuseppe Bottai (1895-1959), Evola wrote a series of articles in Bottai's *Critica Fascista* in 1926-27, praising the Roman Empire as a synthesis of the sacred and the regal, an aristocratic and hierarchical system under a true leader. Evola rejected the Catholic Church as a source of religion and morality independent of the state, because he saw its universalistic claims as compatible with and tending toward liberal egalitarianism and humanitarianism, despite its anti-Communist rhetoric.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evola's articles enjoyed a national succès de scandale and he expanded them into a book, *Imperialismo Pagano* (1928), which provoked a heated debate involving many Fascist and Catholic intellectuals, including, significantly, Giovanni Battista Montini (1897-1978), who, when Evola published the second edition of *Men Among the Ruins* in 1967, had become the liberal Pope Paul VI. Meanwhile, Mussolini was negotiating with Pope Pius XI (1857-1939) for a reconciliation in which the Church would give its blessings to his regime in return for protection of its property and official recognition as the religion of Italy. Italy had been united by the Piedmontese conquest of Papal Rome in 1870 and the Popes had never recognized the new regime. So Evola wrote in 1928, "Every Italian and every Fascist should remember that the King of Italy is still considered a usurper by the Vatican."[31] The signing of the Vatican Accords on February 11, 1929, ended that situation and the debate. Even Reghini and Bottai turned against Evola.[32]

Evola later regretted the tone of his polemic, but he also pointed out that the fact that this debate took place gave the lie direct to extreme assertions about lack of freedom of speech in Fascist Italy. Evola has been vindicated on the main point. The Catholic Church accepts liberal democracy and even defends it as the only legitimate regime. Notre Dame University is not the only Catholic university with a Jacques Maritain Center, but neither Notre Dame nor any other Catholic university in America has a Center named after Joseph de Maistre or Louis de Bonald or Juan Donoso Cortés. Pope Pius IX was beatified for proclaiming the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, not for his Syllabus Errorum, which denounced the idea of coming to terms with liberalism and modern civilization.

Those who want to distance Evola from Fascism emphasize the debate over Pagan Imperialism. For several years afterwards Fascist toughs harassed Evola, until he won the patronage of Roberto Farinacci, the Fascist boss of Cremona. Evola edited the opinion page of Farinacci's newspaper, *Regime Fascista*, from 1934 to 1943 in an independent fashion. Although there are anecdotes about Mussolini's fear of Evola, the documentary evidence points in the opposite direction. Yvon de Begnac's talks with Mussolini, published in 1990, report Mussolini consistently speaking of Evola with respect. Il Duce had the following comments about the Pagan Imperialism debate:

> Despite what is generally thought, I was not at all irritated by Doctor Julius Evola's pronouncements made a few months before the Conciliation on the modification of relations between the Holy See and Italy. Anyhow, Doctor Evola's attitude did not directly concern relations between Italy and the Holy See, but what seemed to him the long-term irreconcilability of the Roman tradition and the Catholic tradition. Since he identified Fascism with the Roman tradition, he had no choice but to reckon as its adversary any historical vision of a universalistic order.[33]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mussolini's strongest support for Evola came on the subject of race, which became an issue after Italy's conquest of Ethiopia in 1936. Influenced by Nazi Germany, Italy passed Racial Laws in 1938. Evola was already writing on the racial views consistent with a Traditional vision of mankind in opposition to what he saw as the biological reductionism and materialism of Nazi racial thought. His writings infuriated Guido Landra, editor of the journal, *La Difesa della Razza* (Defense of the Race). Landra and other scientific racists were especially irritated by Evola's article, "Scientific Racism's Mistake."[34] Mussolini, however, praised Evola's writings as early as 1935 and permitted Evola's *Summary of Racial Doctrine* to be translated into German as *Compendium of Fascist Racial Doctrine* to represent the official Fascist position.[35]

Evola accepts the Traditional division of man into body, soul and spirit and argues that there are races of all three.

> While in a 'pure blood' horse or cat the biological element constitutes the central one, and therefore racial considerations can be legitimately restricted to it, this is certainly not the case with man, or at least any man worthy of the name . . . Therefore racial treatment of man can not stop only at a biological level.[36]

Just as the state creates the people and the nation, so the spirit forms the races of body and soul. Evola had done considerable research on the history of racial studies and wrote a history of racial thought from Classical Antiquity to the 1930's, *The Blood Myth: The Genesis of Racism*.[37] Evola knew that in addition to the tradition of scientific racism, represented by Gobineau, Houston Steward Chamberlain, Alfred Rosenberg, and Landra was one that appreciated extra- or super-biological elements and whose adherents included Montaigne, Herder, Fichte, Gustave Le Bon, and Evola's contemporary and friend, Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, a German biologist at the University of Berlin.[38]

Hansen has a thorough discussion of "Evola's Attitude Toward the Jews." Evola thought that the negative traits associated with Jews were spiritual, not physical. So a biological Jew might have an Aryan soul or spirit and biological Aryans might – and did – have a Semitic soul or spirit. As Landra saw, this was the end of any politically useful scientific racism. The greatest academic authority on Fascism, Renzo de Felice argued in *The Jews in Fascism Italy* that Evola's theories are wrong, but that they have a distinguished intellectual ancestry, and Evola argued for them in an honorable way.[39] In recent years, Bill Clinton was proclaimed America's first black president. This instinctive privileging of style over biology is in line with Evola's views.

Hansen does not discuss Evola's views on Negroes, to which Christophe Boutin devotes several pages of *Politique et Tradition*.[40] In his 1968 collection of essays, *The Bow and the Club*,[41] there is a chapter on "America Negrizzata," which argues that, while there was relatively little miscegenation in the United States, the Telluric or Negro spirit has had considerable influence on the quality of American culture. The 1972 edition of *Men Among the Ruins* ends with an "Appendix on the Myths of our Time," of which number IV is "Taboos of our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Times."[42] The two taboos discussed forbid a frank discussion of the "working class," common in Europe, and of the Negro. Although written thirty years ago, it is up-to-date in its description of this subject and notices that the word "Negro" itself was becoming taboo as "offensive."[43] La vera Destra, a real Right, will oppose this development. This appendix is not translated in the Inner Traditions or the 1991 German editions, confirming its accuracy.

At the end of *Men Among the Ruins*, instead of the Appendix of the 1972 edition, stands Evola's 1951 *Autodifesa*,[44] the speech he gave in his own defense when he was tried by the Italian democracy for "defending Fascism," attempting to reconstitute the dissolved Fascist Party" and being the "master" and inspirer" of young Neo-Fascists. Like Socrates, he was accused of not worshipping the gods of the democracy and of corrupting youth. When he asked in open court where in his published writings he had defended "ideas proper to Fascism," the prosecutor, Dr. Sangiorgi, admitted that there were no such passages, but that the general spirit of his works promoted "ideas proper to Fascism," such as monocracy, hierarchism, aristocracy or elitism. Evola responded.

> I should say that if such are the terms of the accusation,[45] I would be honored to see, seated at the same bank of accusation, such people as Aristotle, Plato, the Dante of De Monarchia, and so on up to Metternich and Bismarck.[46] In the same spirit as a Metternich, a Bismarck, or the great Catholic philosophers of the principle of authority, De Maistre and Donoso Cortés, I reject all that which derives, directly or indirectly, from the French Revolution and which, in my opinion, has as its extreme consequence bolshevism; to which I counterpose the 'world of Tradition.' . . . My principles are only those that, before the French Revolution, every well-born person considered sane and normal.[47]

Evola's *Autodifesa* was more effective than Socrates' *Apology*, since the jury found him "innocent" of the charges. (Italian juries may find a defendant "innocent," "not guilty for lack of proof," or "guilty.") Evola noted in his speech, "Some like to depict Fascism as an 'oblique tyranny.'[48] During that 'tyranny' I never had to undergo a situation like the present one." Evola was no lackey of the Fascist regime. He attacked conciliation with the Vatican in the years before the 1929 Vatican Accords and developed an interpretation of race that directly contradicted the one favored by the German government and important currents within Fascism. His journal, *La Torre* (The Tower), was closed down in 1930 because of his criticism of Fascist toughs, gli squadristi. Evola, however, never had to face jail for his serious writings during the Fascist era. That had to wait for liberal democracy. Godwin and Hansen are absolutely correct to emphasize Evola's consistency and coherence as an esoteric thinker and his independence from any party-line adherence to Fascism. On the other hand, Evola considered his politics a direct deduction from his beliefs about Tradition. He was a sympathetic critic of Fascism, but a remorseless opponent of liberal democracy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Inner Traditions and the Holmes Publishing Group[49] have published translations of most of Evola's esoteric writings and some important political books. Will they go on to publish the rest of his oeuvre? Joscelyn Godwin, after all, wrote, "It would be intellectually dishonest to suppress anything." Evola's book on Ernst Jünger might encourage a translation of *Der Arbeiter*. *Riding the Tiger*[50] explains how the "differentiated man" (uomo differenziato) can maintain his integrity in the Dark Age. It bears the same relation to *Men Among the Ruins* that Aristotle's *Ethics* bears to his Politics and, although published later, was written at the same time.[51] There are brilliant essays in *The Bow and the Club*, but can a book be published in contemporary America with an essay entitled "America Negrizzata?" *Pagan Imperialism* is a young man's book, vigorous and invigorating.

The most challenging book for readers who enjoy *Men Among the Ruins* is *Fascism Seen from the Right*, with its appendix, "Notes on the Third Reich,"[52] where Evola criticizes both regimes as not right-wing enough. A world respectful of communism and liberalism (and accustomed to using the word "Fascist" as an angry epithet) will find it hard to appreciate a book critical, but not disrespectful, of il Ventennio (the Twenty Years of Fascist rule). I would suggest beginning with the short pamphlet, *Orientamenti* (Orientations),[53] which Evola composed in 1950 as a summary of the doctrine of *Men Among the Ruins*.

Hansen quotes right-wing Italians who say that Evola's influence discourages political action because his Tradition comes from an impossibly distant past and assumes an impossibly transcendent truth and a hopelessly pessimistic view of the present. Yet Evola confronts the modern world with an absolute challenge. Its materialism, egalitarianism, feminism, and economism are fundamentally wrong. The way out is through rejecting these mistakes and returning to spirit, transcendence and hierarchy, to the Männerbund and the Legionary Spirit. It may be discouraging to think that we are living in a Dark Age, but the Kali Yuga is also the end of a cosmic cycle. When the current age ends, a new one will begin. This is not Spengler's biologistic vision, where our civilization is an individual, not linked to earlier ones and doomed to die without offspring, like all earlier ones.[54]

We are linked to the past by Tradition and when the Dark Age comes to an end, Tradition will light the way to new greatness and accomplishment. We may live to see that day. If not, what will survive is the legionary spirit Evola described in *Orientamenti*:

> It is the attitude of a man who can choose the hardest road, fight even when he knows that the battle is materially lost and live up to the words of the ancient saga, 'Loyalty is stronger than fire!' Through him the traditional idea is asserted, that it is the sense of honor and of shame – not halfway measures drawn from middle class moralities – that creates a substantial, existential difference among beings, almost as great as between one race and another race…. If anything

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> positive can be accomplished today or tomorrow, it will not come from the skills of agitators and politicians, but from the natural prestige of men both of yesterday but also, and more so, from the new generation, who recognize what they can achieve and so vouch for their idea.[55]

This is the ideal of Oswald Spengler's Roman soldier, who died at this post at Pompeii as the sky fell on him, because he had not been relieved. We do not need programs and marketing strategies, but men like that. "It is men, provided they are really men, who make and unmake history." Evola's ideal continues to speak to the right person. "Keep your eye on just one thing: to remain on your feet in a world of ruins."[56]

E. Christian Kopff, Associate Director, Honors Program, University of Colorado, Boulder and author of ***The Devil Knows Latin: Why America Needs the Classical Tradition*** *(ISI Books: Wilmington, DE, 1999), was Fellow in Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome.*

End Notes

1. *La dottrina del risveglio*, Bari, 1943, revised in 1965.

2. *Lo Yoga della potenza*, Milan, 1949, revised in 1968, was a new edition of *L'Uomo come Potenza*, Rome, 1926; Metafisica del sesso, Rome, 1958, revised 1969.

3. *Introduzione alla magia quale scienza del'Io*, 3 volumes, Rome, 1927-29, revised 1971, *Introduction to Magic: Rituals and Practical Techniques for the Magus*, Rochester, VT: 2001; *La tradizione hermetica* (Bari, 1931), revised 1948, 1971; *The Hermetic Tradition*, Rochester, VT: 1995.

4. *Rivolta contro il mondo moderno*, Milan, 1934, revised 1951, 1969.

5. Robin Waterfield gives a useful bibliography at the end of his *Gnosis* essay (note 8, below) p. 17.

6. Karlheinz Weissman, "Bibliographie" in *Menschen immitten von Ruinen*, Tübingen, 1991, pp. 403-406, e.g., *Heidnischer Imperialismus*, Leipzig, 1933; *Erhebung wider die moderne Welt*, Stuttgart, 1935; *Revolte gegen die moderne Welt*, Berlin, 1982; *Den Tiger Reiten*, Vilsborg, 1997.

7. Thomas Sheehan, "Myth and Violence: The Fascism of Julius Evola and Alain de Benoist," *Social Research* 48: 1981, pp. 45-73; Franco Ferraresi, "Julius Evola: tradition, reaction and the Radical Right," *Archives européennes de sociologie* 28: 1987, pp. 107-151; Richard Drake, "Julius Evola and the Ideological Origins of the Radical Right in Contemporary Italy," in Peter H. Merkl, (ed.), *Political Violence and Terror: Motifs and Motivations*, Berkeley, 1986, pp. 61-89; idem, *The Revolutionary Mystique and Terrorism in Contemporary Italy*, Bloomington, 1989.

8. Robin Waterfield, "Baron Julius Evola and the Hermetic Tradition," *Gnosis* 14:1989-90, pp. 12-17.

9. Elémire Zolla, "The Evolution of Julius Evola's Thought," *Gnosis* 14: 1989-90, pp. 18-20.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

10. Jay Kinney, "Who's Afraid of the Bogeyman? The Phantasm of Esoteric Terrorism," *Gnosis* 14: 1989-90, pp. 21-24.

11. *Gli uomini e le rovine*, Rome, 1953, revised 1967, with a new appendix, 1972.

12. H. T. Hansen, "Julius Evolas politisches Wirken," *Menshen immitten von Ruinen* (note 6, above) pp. 7-131.

13. H. T. Hansen, "A Short Introduction to Julius Evola" in *Revolt Against the Modern World*, Rochester, VT, 1995, ix-xxii, translated from Hansen's article in *Theosophical History* 5, January 1994, pp. 11-22.

14. Christophe Boutin, *Politique et Tradition: Julius Evola dans le siècle*, 1898-1974; Paris, 1992.

15. *Il mistero del Graal e la tradizione ghibellina dell'Impero*, Bari, 1937, revised 1962, 1972; translated as *The Mystery of the Grail: Initiation and Magic in the Quest for the Spirit*, Rochester, VT, 1997.

16. *René Gu non, Crise du monde moderne* (Paris, 1927) has been translated several times into English.

17. H. T. Hansen, "Julius Evola und die deutsche konservative Revolution," *Criticón* 158 (April / Mai / June 1998) pp. 16-32.

18. *Diorema: Antologia della pagina special di "Regime Fascista,"* Marco Tarchi, (ed.) Rome, 1974.

19. *Lettere di Julius Evola a Carl Schmitt 1951-1963*, Rome, 2000.

20. *L"Operaio" nel pensiero di Ernst Jünger* (Rome, 1960), revised 1974; reprinted with additions, 1998.

21. *The Concept of the Political*, New Brunswick, NJ, 1976; *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, Cambridge, MA, 1985; *Political Theology*, Cambrige, MA, 1985; *Political Romanticism*, Cambridge, MA, 1986. Recent commentary includes Paul Gottfried, *Carl Schmitt: Politics and Theory*, New York, 1990; Gopal Balakrishnan, *The Enemy: An Intellectual Portrait of Carl Schmitt*, London, 2000.

22. Ernst Jünger, *Der Arbeiter. Herrschaft und Gestalt*, Hamburg, 1932, was translated into Italian in 1985.

23. Armin Mohler, *Die konservative Revolution in Deutschland*, 1918-1932. Stuttgart, 1950, revised and expanded in 1972, 1989, 1994, 1999.

24. Panajotis Kondylis, *Conservativismus: Geschichtlicher Gehalt und Untergang*, Stuttgart, 1986, devotes 553 pages to this theme.

25. My impression is that daimonìa dell'economia implies "demonic possession by the economy." In *Orientamenti* (see note 53, below), Evola writes of "l'allucinazione e la daimonìa dell'economia," "hallucination and demonic possession."

26. *Men Among the Ruins: Post-War Reflections of a Radical Traditionalist*, Rochester, VT, 2002, p. 166. "Absurd and deplorable" is for assurdo peggiore, literally, "the worst absurdity;" circolo buio e chiuso "dark and small circle," literally "dark and closed circle." Chiuso is used in weather reports for "overcast."

27. Evola applied for membership in the Fascist Party in 1939 in order to enlist in the army as an officer, but in vain for reasons discussed by Hansen (note 26, above) xiii. The application was found by Dana Lloyd Thomas, "Quando Evola du degradato," *Il Borghese*, March 29, 1999, pp. 10-13. Evola mentioned this in an interview with Gianfranco De Turris, *I'Italiano* 11, September, 1971, which can be found in some reprints of *L'Orientamenti*, e.g., Catania, 1981, 33 (See note 53, below).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

28. Evola cites *Heinrich Schurtz, Altersklassen und Männerbünde: Eine Darstellung der Grundformen der Gesellschaft*, Berlin, 1902; A. van Gennep, *Les rites du passage*, Paris, 1909; *The Rites of Passage*, Chicago, 1960.

29. *Men Among the Ruins* (note 26, above) pp. 210-211; *Gli uomini e le rovine* (note 11, above) pp. 15-151. "A ridiculous hybrid and illegitimate organization" translates questa ridicola associazione ibrida e bastarda.

30. Elémire Zolla gives the essentials about Reghini's influence on Evola in his *Gnosis* essay (note 9, above).

31. *Imperialismo Pagano*, Rome, 1928, p. 40.

32. Richard Drake, "Julius Evola, Radical Fascism, and the Lateran Accords," *Catholic Historical Review* 74, 1988, pp. 403-319; E. Christian Kopff. "Italian Fascism and the Roman Empire," *Classical Bulletin* 76: 2000, pp. 109-115.

33. Yvon de Begnac, Taccuini Mussoliniani, Francesco Perfetti, (ed.), *Bologna*, 1990, p. 647.

34. "L'Equivoco del razzismo scientifico," *Vita Italiana* 30, September 1942.

35. *Sintesi di dottrina della razza*, Milan, 1941; *Grundrisse der faschistischen Rassenlehre* , Berlin, 1943.

36. *Sintesi di dottrina della razza* (note 35, above) p. 35. Since Hansen (note 26, above) 71 uses the German translation (note 12, above) 90, the last sentence reads "Fascist racial doctrine (Die faschistischen Rassenlehre) therefore holds a purely biological view of race to be inadequate."

37. *Il mito del sangue: Genesi del razzismo*, Rome, 1937, revised 1942.

38. Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, *Rasse und Seele. Eine Einführung in den Sinn der leiblichen Gestalt*, Munich, 1937; *Rasse ist Gestalt*, Munich, 1937.

39. Renzo de Felice, *The Jews in Fascist Italy: A History*, New York, 2001, 378, translation of *Storia degli Ebrei Italiani sotto il Fascismo*, Turin, 1961, revised 1972, 1988, 1993. Evola is discussed on pp. 392-3.

40. Boutin (note 14, above) pp. 197-200.

41. *L'Arco e la clava*, Milan, 1968, revised 1971. The article is pp. 39-46 of the new edition, Rome, 1995.

42. *Gli uomini e le rovine* (note 11, above) Appendice sui miti del nostro tempo, pp. 255-282; Tabù dei nostri tempi, pp. 275-282.

43. *Gli uomini e le rovine* (note 11, above) p. 276: la tabuizzazione che porta fino ad evitare l'uso della designazione "negro," per le sue implicazioni "offensive."

44. J. Evola, *Autodifesa* (Quaderni di testi Evoliani, no. 2) (Rome, n.d.)

45. Banco degli accusati is what is called in England the "prisoner's dock."

46. At this point, according to *Autodifesa* (note 44, above) p. 4, Evola's lawyer, Franceso Carnelutti, called out, "La polizia è andata in cerca anche di costoro." ("The police have gone to look for them, too.")

47. *Men Among the Ruins* (note 25, above) pp. 293-294; *Autodifesa* (note 44, above) pp. 10-11.

48. Bieca is literally "oblique," but in this context means rather "grim, sinister."

49. Holmes Publishing Group (Edwards, WA) has published shorter works by Evola edited by the Julius Evola Foundation in Rome, e.g. *René Guénon: A Teacher for Modern Times*; *Taoism: The Magic of Mysticism*; *Zen: The Religion of the Samurai*; *The Path of Enlightenment in the Mithraic Mysteries*.

50. *Cavalcare la tigre*, Rome, 1961, revised 1971.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

51. Gianfranco de Turris, "Nota del Curatore," *Cavalcare la tigre* , 5th edition: Rome, 1995, pp. 7-11.

52. *Il Fascismo*, Rome, 1964; *Il Fascismo visto dalla Destra*, con Note sul terzo Reich, Rome, 1970.

53. *Orientamenti* (Rome, 1951), with many reprints.

54. J. Evola, *Spengler e "Il tramonto dell'Occidente"* (Quaderni di testi Evoliani, no. 14) (Rome, 1981).

55. *Orientamenti*, (note 53, above), p. 12; somewhat differently translated by Hansen (note 26, above) p. 101.

56. *Orientamenti* (note 53, above) p. 16. Hansen (note 26, above) p. 93 translates "It is humans, as far as they are truly human, that make history or tear it down," reflecting the German (note 12, above) p. 118: "Es sind die Menschen, sofern sie wahrhaft Menschen sind, die die Geschichte machen oder sie niederreissen." The parallel sentence in *Men Among the Ruins* (note 11, above) p. 109: sono gli uomini, finché sono veramente tali, a fare o a disfare la storia, is translated by Stucco (note 26, above) p. 181: "It is men who make or undo history." He omits finché sono veramente tali, but gets the meaning of uomini right.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Few Good Men ...

The Siege of Vienna

John Stoye
Edinburgh, Birlinn Limited, 2000
$19.95 US pb

xvi + 226 pp.

Reviewed by Wayne Lutton

Since the events of September 11, 2001, the inhabitants of the Western world have been subjected to a relentless public relations campaign centered on the notion that "Islam is a religion of Peace" ... and tolerance. An example of what cold warriors used to describe as "disinformation" appeared in the *New York Times* of March 28, 2002. There Maria Rosa Menocal, director of the Whitney Humanities Center at Yale University, asserted that one of the greatest neglected lessons of history is that enlightened Muslims created "the most advanced culture in Europe" after they conquered the Iberian Peninsula 1,300 years ago. "Al Andalus, as the Muslims called their Spanish homeland [sic] prospered in a culture of openness and assimilation," writes Ms. Menocal.

This contrasts sharply with the views of the people who were actually on the receiving end of the Muslim onslaught those many centuries ago. They saw Islam as a "Religion of the Sword," as indeed it was from the time that Mohammed united the tribes of Arabia and, following his death in 632, his successors went on a rampage against the Western world that only came to a halt in the fall of 1683, when a Pan-European Christian army led by King John Sobieski of Poland lifted the Muslim siege of Vienna on September 13, 1683.

John Stoye of Magdalen College, Oxford, wrote the first account in English of this turning point in European history. Originally published in 1964, a revised edition is in print and now available in the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Following their conquest of Constantinople, the Ottoman Turks, in time, went on to take the Balkans. By the spring of 1683, their ruthless Grand Vizier, Kara Mustafa, decided to launch a major campaign to seize the rest of Hungary and advance into Central Europe. The Turks' main rival in the region was Austria, whose monarch, Leopold I, was both the King of Austria, Bohemia and Habsburg Hungary, and Holy Roman Emperor (of a collection of feudal German states and independent cities).

The Turks received encouragement from Louis XIV, the "Sun King" of France. During the second half of 1682, his diplomatic representative to the Sublime Porte did everything in his power to persuade Kara Mustafa to direct his army toward Austria, not Poland or Russia, as had been mooted about by Ottoman strategists. Louis XIV had designs on northwestern and Rhenish states in Europe. The Habsburgs were the strongest of his potential adversaries.

On March 30, 1683, the Turks' vanguard of Janissaries set out from Belgrade. By May, a host estimated at over 100,000 Europeans, Asians, and Africans was heading toward Vienna. The Habsburg commander-in-chief, Charles V of Lorraine, could muster only 33,000. Leopold fled his capital, and Vienna was placed under siege on July 16.

Pope Innocent XI called for a Holy Alliance of Christian princes to resist the Muslim horde. The author portrays Innocent as a true Defender of the West who "never slackened since the day of his election" (in 1676) to organize a Crusade against the Sultan. Innocent pledged the revenues of the Church to help raise an army.

King John Sobieski III of Poland, a veteran of the wars against the Turks, was willing to lead a contingent in support of the Habsburgs. But he had to have the unanimous approval of the Polish Diet. Louis XIV's agents tried to bribe key members into vetoing the proposal. The papal nuncio, Pallavicini, was ordered by Innocent XI to use his powers, including those of his purse, to outbid the French. This they managed, though just barely. King John then set about to raise an army of 40,000.

While Kara Mustafa's savage Tartar allies pillaged the surrounding countryside, the Turkish engineers went about the business of constructing siege lines and undermining the city's defenses. Mustafa's great gamble nearly succeeded. Dysentery, considered by the author "the Turks' strongest ally," spread fast among the soldiers and remaining civil population of Vienna. The Muslims were on the verge of breaching the last defensive works, when, on September 9, it was announced that a relief force was assembling nearby.

Commanded by King John Sobieski, and including valuable reinforcements from Bavaria, Franconia, Thuringia, and Saxony, the allies attacked the Turks on September 12, a Sunday. Writes Stoye: "At last the hour was reached when the Christian army, to use the emphatic language of a contemporary Turkish writer, became a flood of black pitch coming down the mountain, consuming

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

everything it touched." The next day, Sobieski made his victorious entry into Vienna, in advance of Emperor Leopold, to the acclamation of the grateful Viennese public.

In what has been dubbed the Last of the Crusades (from 1683-1699), Poland, Hungary, Austria, the Papal States, and such Mediterranean powers as Savoy continued to exert military pressure against the Turks. At Zenta on September 11, 1697, Prince Eugene of Savoy caught the Ottoman army as it was trying to cross the River Tisza in Serbia, inflicting 30,000 casualties at a cost of only 300. The sultan then sued for peace, which was signed at Karlowitz in 1699. Austria gained Transylvania and most of Hungary. While the Turks retained the Banat of Temesvar, they ceded most of the Morea to Venice. Following a series of military reforms, the Turks renewed the war in 1716 but were again defeated by Prince Eugene at Peterwardein on August 5, 1716, before finally being thrown out of Belgrade on August 22, 1717.

The French took advantage of the Turkish Wars to attempt to expand at the expense of their neighbors (in the War of Devolution, 1667-68; the Franco-Dutch War, 1672-78; the Rhineland Campaigns, 1674-75; the Scanian War, 1674-79; the Devastation of the Palatinate, 1688-89; the Nine Years War, 1688-97, the War of the Spanish Succession, 1701-14, etc.) Fortunately, the Ottomans had been so weakened that the Muslims were never again able to mount a serious threat to the West.

Stoye is a skilled writer and a master of this subject. His account of the siege, peopled by some extraordinary characters, including the garrison commandant, Count Stahremberg, who managed to hold out until the relief force arrived, makes for inspiring reading.

Today, the great men of the West who fought the Muslims are tarred as "enemies of cultural openness" (cf. Menocal). Christian leaders condemn as "overly judgmental" those of their congregants who believe that non-Christian religions should not be made welcome. And in France, and other parts of the European Union, writers are subject to fine and possible imprisonment for daring to publicly criticize the growing Muslim presence in Western countries.

Stoye's book thus serves as a reminder of how earlier generations of Europeans reacted when outsiders attempted to force "diversity" and "multiculturalism" on their societies. Far from being a virtue, "tolerance" of the wrong variety can lead to cultural suicide and risks the very extinction of peoples. Men and women of character will not let this occur without a fight.

Wayne Lutton, who holds a Ph.D. in military history, is the editor of The Social Contract.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Diversity To Advocacy Journalism

Coloring the News:
How Crusading for Diversity Has Corrupted American Journalism

William McGowan
San Francisco, Ca: Encounter Books, 2001
$25.95 US

278 pp.

Reviewed by John Attarian

For decades conservatives have complained unavailingly of liberal bias in the media. *Coloring the News*, by veteran journalist and Manhattan Institute fellow William McGowan, powerfully supports this charge, revealing that journalism in regarding "diversity issues" race, feminism, homosexuality, affirmative action and immigration consistently sacrifices truth and fairness to political correctness.

McGowan traces this to a campaign to open up journalism to minorities and minority perspectives. A self-proclaimed "pragmatist" committed to fairness and intellectual honesty, he calls this a "worthy, overdue, and historically necessary effort." However, a decade of observing the diversity drive's consequences led him to conclude that it is harming both journalism and America's civic culture.

To promote diversity, major newspapers, magazines, and news organizations use hiring and quotas and have created beats and columns for minorities and homosexuals. Many senior editors' pay and promotions are tied to minority hiring and promotions. Style guides abound to ensure politically correct copy devoid of offensive words and stereotypes. Some papers monitor their pages for quantity of minority coverage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And coverage of diversity issues became biased and untrustworthy. Throughout McGowan's wealth of specific examples, the same pattern recurs. Initial coverage of an incident or topic compromises truth "to filter out realities that might undercut the cause." Opposition to affirmative action, gay marriage, immigration, and so on is either not covered, or presented unfavorably. When politically incorrect truth emerges later, it is covered minimally or not at all.

Thus, the media often do not report the race of criminals. The purported wave of church burnings in 1996 was uncritically taken as evidence of still-virulent white racism. When it emerged that there was no pattern of racist burnings, and that more white churches than black ones were burned in January 1995-May 1997, some papers such as the *New York Times* buried it.

The press uncritically accepted the pro-abortion lobby's false assertion that few such abortions are performed. Even when Ron Fitzsimmons of the National League of Abortion Providers admitted that he had lied in declaring these abortions rare, the press dodged the "clear implication" that the abortion lobby was being untruthful. While homosexual Matthew Shepard's murder received 3,007 stories in the first month alone, the abduction, abuse and murder of 13-year-old Jesse Dirkhising by two homosexuals got only 46 stories in the first month. Trial coverage was similarly lopsided. Investigating the disparity. McGowan received evasive answers. "No one admitted the obvious: that the Dirkhising story was too hot to handle" because it spotlighted gay pedophilia and threatened to demolish "the gays-as-victims script which had attained the status of holy writ in the media."

The press slights or ignores evidence of affirmative action's drawbacks. When Washington, D.C.'s police department lowered hiring standards and minimized criminal background checks in 1989 and 1990 to increase minority hiring, former criminals became Washington policemen. The *Washington Post*'s coverage omitted the link between minority recruitment goals, lowered standards, and corruption. Similarly, coverage of affirmative action in college admissions ignores the massive remedial efforts and high minority dropout rates at elite schools.

Mainstream media have been reluctant to tackle immigrant crime, bilingual education's negative consequences, and Hispanic illegitimacy. Voodoo, Santeria animal sacrifice, and other immigrant practices receive respectful treatment.

So newsroom diversity turns out to be "skin deep." A publisher interested in "real diversity," McGowan rightly argues, would hire, say, a pro-life woman or born-again Christian. But his research has convinced him that "these viewpoints, and others considered retrograde, are systematically excluded from today's newsroom." The push to hire women and minorities, who are more liberal than white men, merely strengthen journalism's liberal bent.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Subordinating critical judgment and truth-seeking to self-righteous liberal ideology has undermined media credibility, alienated many Americans, insulated liberalism from any need for self-criticism, and reinforced negative opinions of minorities. Worst of all, McGowan writes, the diversity crusade has oversimplified complicated realities and weakened the "spirit of public cooperation and trust" needed for multiethnic and multiracial societies. "A sound public discourse requires the press to be an enemy of political demagoguery, not a vehicle for it."

Coloring the News does have grave weaknesses. McGowan hardly supports his assertions of the media's past "pernicious stereotypes" of homosexuals and "sins of racial, ethnic and cultural exclusion." He apparently fears that the diversity drive will be self-defeating—revealing that he is less "pragmatist" than liberal. And his complaints are startlingly naïve. "Instead of fostering detached, neutral reporting and analysis, the diversity mandate has given us advocacy." What did he think was going to happen? Given liberalism's axiom that institutions should change society, its decades-long trashing of whites, males, and traditional sexual mores, and its anointing of blacks, women, and homosexuals as victims, it was inevitable that aggressively recruiting from among the ranks of these aggrieved "victims" would reinforce the mass media's image as an advocate of both multiculturalism and egalitarianism. McGowan is clueless to simultaneously endorse diversity and bemoan its predictable consequences.

Nevertheless, McGowan does furnish valuable intellectual ammunition for conservatives. His sympathy with diversity and his restrained tone make it difficult for doctrinaire liberals to dismiss him as a jaundiced spear-carrier for the right. Unfortunately, McGowan's sympathetic nod toward the concept of "diversity" suggests that he genuinely fails to connect the dots and identify the crux of the dilemma that he has shed so much light on: the enshrinement of a minority-victimization agenda to the forefront of the news media. Truth will eventually triumph over falsehoods, and *Coloring the News*, while stumbling blindly onto the truth, is still a useful contribution in exposing the obvious double-standards involved in promoting (in some cases) or silencing (in other instances) minority-entrenched issues and interests.

John Attarian is a freelance writer in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and author most recently of ***Economism And The National Prospect****, American Immigration Control Foundation, 2001.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About the Editors

- **Editor**

Kevin Lamb, a Hoosier native and graduate of Indiana University, with undergraduate degrees in political science and journalism, is a conservative freelance writer who has published in several periodicals, including *National Review*, *Chronicles*, *The Asian Wall Street Journal*, *Society*, *Mankind Quarterly*, *Conservative Review*, *The Journal of Social, Political & Economic Studies*, and is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract* and *Right Now*. A former intern of the National Journalism Center (Washington, DC), and former Marine reservist, Mr. Lamb resides with his family near Washington, DC, where he works as a librarian and research assistant.

- **Associate Editor & Book Editor**

Samuel Francis, Ph.D., is a graduate of Johns Hopkins University (BA, 69) and the University of North Carolina, (MA, 71; PhD 79), and former policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation as well as a former U.S. Senate staff member. Formerly an award-winning staff columnist with *The Washington Times*, where he served as editorial writer, 1986-91, deputy editorial page editor, 1987-91, Dr. Francis writes a nationally syndicated column, is a contributing editor to *Chronicles*, where he writes a monthly column "Principalities and Powers," and is currently Editor-in-Chief of the *Citizens Informer*. He is the author of *The Soviet Strategy of Terror*, Heritage Foundation, 1981; *Power and History: The Political Thought of James Burnham*, University Press of America, 1983; *Beautiful Losers: Essays on the Failure of American Conservatism*, University of Missouri Press, 1993; and *Revolution from the Middle*, Middle American Press, 1996. His writings have appeared in major newspapers and magazines, including *The New York Times*, *USA Today*, *National Review*, *The Spectator* (London). Dr. Francis also serves on the Board of Editorial Advisors for *Modern Age: A Quarterly Review*.

- **Web Edition Editor**

Louis Andrews is a graduate of the College of Charleston (BS, 66) and did graduate work in the Department of History at the University of South Carolina. He is a businessman, web developer, and writer and has been published in *Right Now!*, the *Augusta Chronicle*, and the online journal *pinc* for which he served as book review editor. He is also the developer and web-master of the Stalking the Wild Taboo website. Though a native of South Carolina, Mr. Andrews has lived in Augusta, GA since 1982.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Advisory Board

Virginia Abernethy, Ph.D., emeritus professor of psychiatry Vanderbilt University Medical School, is the author of *Population Politics: The Choices that Shape Our Future* (Insight Books, 1993; Transaction 1999), *Population Pressure and Cultural Adjustment* (Human Sciences Press, 1979) and (editor) *Frontiers in Medical Ethics: Applications in a Medical Setting* (Ballinger, 1980). A former editor of *Population and Environment*, she is the author of numerous articles in professional journals and member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. She is a graduate of Wellesley College (B.A., 1955) and Harvard University (M.A. 1969, Ph.D., 1970).

Frank Ellis, Ph.D., is Lecturer in Russian at the University of Leeds, England and is the author of *Vasily Grossman: The Genesis and Evolution of a Russian Heretic* (Berg, 1994), *From Glasnost to the Internet: Russia's New Infosphere* (St. Martin's Press, 1999), and *The Macpherson Report: 'Anti-racist' Hysteria and Sovietization of the United Kingdom* (Right Now Press Ltd, 2001). He has published articles on topics that range from Soviet war literature to political correctness. Prior to taking up an academic career he was a professional soldier and served in the parachute regiment of the Special Air Service.

Joseph E. Fallon, author of *Deconstructing America: Immigration, Nationality and Statehood* and a co-editor of the seven-volume history *German-Americans in the World Wars*, is a freelance writer / researcher. He began his Masters Degree program at the American University of Cairo, Egypt and obtained his Masters in International Affairs from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs.

Wayne Lutton, Ph.D., editor of *The Social Contract*, is a policy analyst and historian. He has published widely on population and immigration concerns. With a Ph.D. in history, Dr. Lutton has been research director for an educational institute and a college professor. He is the author or contributor to many books and monographs including *The Immigration Time Bomb* (revised 1988), and *The Immigration Invasion*. His articles and reviews have appeared in *Chronicles*, *National Review*, *The Social Contract* and other journals of scholarship and opinion.

Richard Lynn, Ph.D., professor emeritus of psychology, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Londonderry, Northern Ireland, is the author most recently of (with Tatu Vanhanen) *IQ and the Wealth of Nations (*Praeger, 2002), *Eugenics: A Reassessment* (Praeger, 2001), *The Science of Human Diversity: A History of the Pioneer Fund* (University Press of America, 2001), and *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations* (Praeger, 1996). Other published writings include: "National IQ and Economic Development: A Study of Eighty-One Developing Nations," (with Tatu Vanhanen) *Mankind Quarterly* (Summer 2001), "Geographical Variation in Intelligence," in *The Scientific Study of Human Nature: Tribute to Hans J. Eysenck at Eighty*, (editor) Helmuth Nyborg (Pergamon, 1997), "The Decline of Genotypic Intelligence," and "In Support of the Nutrition Theory," in *The Rising Curve: Long-Term Gains in IQ and Related Measures*, (editor) Ulric Neisser (APA, 1998). A contributor to various monographs and psychological journals, Dr. Lynn's previous books include: *Educational Achievement in Japan: Lessons for the West* (M.E. Sharpe, 1988), (editor) *Dimensions of Personality: Papers in Honour of H.J. Eysenck* (Pergamon, 1981) and *Personality and National Character* (Pergamon, 1971). He currently serves as an editorial advisor to *Mankind Quarterly*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kevin MacDonald, Ph.D., professor of psychology, California State University-Long Beach, is the editor of *Population and Environment* and former editor of the *Human Behavior and Evolution Society Newsletter*. He is the author most recently of *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Praeger, 1998), *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (Praeger, 1998), and *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* (Praeger, 1994). As a frequent contributor to monographs and author of numerous articles in evolutionary psychology, religion and ethnic relations, his previous books include: *Sociobiological Perspectives on Human Development* (Springer-Verlag, 1988), *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis* (Plenum, 1988) and (editor) *Parent-Child Play: Descriptions and Implications* (State University of New York Press, 1993).

Brent A. Nelson, Ph.D., a freelance writer, is the author of *America Balkanized - Immigration's Challenge to Government* (American Immigration Control Foundation 1994) as well as numerous articles and book reviews.

James C. Russell, Ph.D., is the author of *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation* (Oxford University Press, 1994) and has taught classes at Saint Peter's College, New Jersey.

Jared Taylor, editor of *American Renaissance* and president of the New Century Foundation, is a graduate of Yale and of the Paris Institute of Political Studies. He is the author or editor of several books, most recently, *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America* (New Century Books, 1998) and *Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America* (Carroll & Graf, 1992).

Derek Turner, editor of the London-based conservative quarterly *Right Now!*, is a British journalist and frequent contributor to *Chronicles* and *The Social Contract*.

Miles D. Wolpin, Ph.D., J.D., is professor emeritus of political science, State University of New York, Potsdam, (NY) and the author of a dozen books, including *Alternative security and military dissent* (Austin & Winfield, 1994) and *America insecure: arms transfers, global interventionism, and the erosion of national security* (McFarland & Co., 1991) as well as scores of articles on militarism, national security, Third World politics, and immigration. He is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED